

to help them overcome their handicaps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. Con. Res. 418. Concurrent resolution providing for certain priorities for the temporary employment of civilian personnel to conduct the decennial census; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 419. Concurrent resolution establishing a basic fuels policy for the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. Con. Res. 420. Concurrent resolution establishing a basic fuels policy for the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. Con. Res. 421. Concurrent resolution establishing a basic fuels policy for the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H. Con. Res. 422. Concurrent resolution establishing a basic fuels policy for the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H. Con. Res. 423. Concurrent resolution establishing a basic fuels policy for the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 359. Resolution providing for the consideration of bill H.R. 8601; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. Res. 360. Resolution amending House Resolution 56, 86th Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. Res. 361. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the reduction of Federal expenditures and requesting the President to provide the Congress advice, suggestions, plans, and proposals, including legislative recommendations by January 1960, which are better, sounder, and more specific than heretofore to provide for the reduction of all business and agricultural subsidies and a corresponding reduction of all Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. Res. 362. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 8601; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

Mr. GIAIMO presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut memorializing Congress concerning home rule for the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 8877. A bill for the relief of Pierangelo Torre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 8878. A bill for the relief of Manuel Nido; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 8879. A bill for the relief of Elton Alan Charles Peine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 8880. A bill for the relief of Yue Ah Gee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 8881. A bill for the relief of Joseph Ferreri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H.R. 8882. A bill for the relief of John Calvin Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVERING:

H.R. 8883. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ekatrini L. Vasilakopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 8884. A bill for the relief of Hajime Misaka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H.R. 8885. A bill for the relief of William L. Berryman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.R. 8886. A bill for the relief of Michaelangelo Mariano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H.R. 8887. A bill for the relief of Dr. Genesoro Bigornia and Mrs. Patricia S. Bigornia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 8888. A bill for the relief of David John Maria, Angela Maria, and John Elias Maria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

263. The SPEAKER presented a petition of James F. McManus, Levittown, N.Y., relative to a redress of grievance relating to his engagement in the sale of air transportation, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### The Coming Visit of Premier Khrushchev

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, there can be little doubt that the world can look forward to a series of sensational developments in the coming months. A few weeks ago who would have thought that Premier Khrushchev of Russia would be invited to visit the United States as an official guest of the President? Or that Mr. Eisenhower would pay a return visit to Russia?

A large number of people in the United States are alarmed over this turn of events. They feel that by inviting Mr. Khrushchev to this country we will greatly dampen the hopes of people behind the Iron Curtain for eventual liberation.

Conduct of foreign policy is in the hands of the President. He made the decision to exchange visits with Mr. Khrushchev. He sincerely believes that by meeting Mr. Khrushchev face to face he can alleviate to some extent the tensions which threaten world peace.

Mr. Eisenhower is undoubtedly the most respected world figure now in public life. He is placing his tremendous

prestige on the line in the hopes that he can bring about a settlement of some of the world's more serious problems.

I am sure the President recognizes the risks involved. We could be lulled into a state of false security and let up in our determination to counter the Russian's cold war plans. The visits could bring about a split among the Western allies. Mr. Eisenhower's present visit to Europe is an effort to prevent this from happening.

Now that the decision to launch a determined peace offensive has been made, Congress must support the President wholeheartedly. A division at home at this time could be fatal.

I believe the people also have the responsibility to see that Khrushchev is received politely and correctly. Nothing would be gained by insulting him. All of the things he stands for are abhorrent to the American people but let us remember he is a guest of the President and as such he is entitled to a polite reception.

I have stated that on the whole I believe some good can come out of the exchange of visits. Khrushchev's ignorance about America is appalling. He apparently honestly believes that large corporations in this country want war to increase their profits. He also seems to think that workers in this country are enslaved by the "bosses."

If these and other misconceptions can be erased by the visit, it will be worth whatever risks are involved.

Mr. Eisenhower is no babe in the woods at this sort of international diplomacy. Some people in this country have expressed fear that he will be "taken in" by Khrushchev, but there have been reports out of Communist China that the Chinese are fearful Khrushchev will be "taken in" by the President. So perhaps this could cut both ways.

It is important that the world be reminded of the total dedication of the people of this country to peace. Mr. Eisenhower's present trip to Europe and the exchange of visits later are dramatic proof of our desire to build a world in which people can live at peace.

If Mr. Eisenhower can make a breakthrough on this front, if he can reassure Khrushchev that our foreign policy is based solely on a quest for peace, then perhaps some of the suspicions which cloud international relations can be removed.

Let us not kid ourselves that Khrushchev will leave this country a different person. He will still be the ruthless dictator of an aggressive, powerful nation. But perhaps he will understand a little better our hopes for peace and our determination to secure a just and lasting peace even at the risk of using the tremendous power at our command if necessary.

Perhaps he will be more convinced than ever that he cannot win by bluff and that further aggression will be costly to his country.

As patriotic citizens, all of us, I know, hope that Mr. Eisenhower's venture into personal diplomacy will be a resounding success.

**The President Must Submit Better, Sounder, and More Specific Proposals to the Congress Than Heretofore if Federal Debt Is To Be Reduced and Stability Restored to the Dollar**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.**

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the President must submit better, sounder, and more specific proposals to the Congress than heretofore if the Federal debt is to be reduced and stability restored to the dollar.

In a single day, recently, the President told a political rally in Washington, D.C., that—

It is the Republican Party that fights for responsible, sensible fiscal policy.

And sent Congress a message asking:

First. A sky-is-the-limit policy on Federal interest rates. This was turned down by the Congress.

Second. Another increase in the limit on the public debt. This was granted by the Congress.

The President has been talking economy, without calling attention to the performance record of his administration. Actually, the Federal debt has increased by \$19 billion in the past 6 years, and the cost of interest on this debt has risen from \$5.8 billion to \$8 billion during the same period.

Obviously, the President must provide better, sounder, and more specific recommendations to the Congress than heretofore, or the Federal debt will continue to rise, and inflation will destroy the earning power of our people.

I have, therefore, prepared a resolution which I am offering today calling upon the President to provide the Congress advice, suggestions, plans, and proposals, including legislative recommendations by January 1960, which are better, sounder, and more specific than heretofore to provide for the reduction of all business and agricultural subsidies and a corresponding reduction of all Federal income taxes.

I include here the text of my resolution, as well as an article from the Democratic Digest, of September 1959, which discusses some aspects of the current economy drive which have been generally overlooked by that part of the press which is oriented toward the Eisenhower administration:

**HOUSE RESOLUTION 361**

Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the reduction of Federal expenditures and requesting the President to provide the Con-

gress advice, suggestions, plans, and proposals, including legislative recommendations, by January 1960, which are better, sounder, and more specific than heretofore to provide for the reduction of all business and agricultural subsidies and a corresponding reduction of all Federal income taxes

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That it is the sense of the House that in view of the increase in the Federal debt by nineteen billion dollars in the past six years, and the increase in the cost of interest on the Federal debt from five billion eight hundred million dollars to eight billion dollars during the same period there is a pressing need for substantial reductions in Federal expenditures in order to reduce the staggering burden of our ever-increasing Federal debt with its constantly rising interest and refinancing charges and resulting dangerous inflation. The House finds that business and agricultural subsidies to big businessmen and to big farmers, including but not limited to direct grants, disguised grants in the form of nonrepayable loans, postal subsidies, shipping and airline subsidies of various kinds, accelerated tax amortization programs, and indirect grants through long-term, low-interest-rate loans, and other methods and programs, although desirable as a means of assisting these special groups to retain their relative positions in the economy, should be reexamined in the light of the overall need for rigid control and a sizeable reduction of Federal expenditures.

SEC. 2. In view of the foregoing, the President is requested to prepare and transmit to the Congress by January 1960 advice, suggestions, plans, and proposals, including legislative recommendations which are better, sounder, and more specific than heretofore, to provide (1) for the reduction by not less than twenty-five per centum of all business and agricultural subsidies, together with such other specific proposals, including specific legislative recommendations, as he may deem advisable in order not only to prevent further increases in Federal expenditures but to actually reduce them, and (2) for the reduction of Federal income taxes in aggregate amounts equal to the total of the reductions in subsidies effected for the taxable years involved pursuant to such legislative recommendations.

[From the Democratic Digest, September 1959]

**THE STATUS QUO SEEKERS: THEIR SCAREWORDS, "INFLATION"; THEIR TARGET, "PROGRESS"**

Ever since the great crusade (the great crusade, that is, for the bankers and the big industrialists) came sweeping into Washington under the banner emblazoned with that magic word—Eisenhower—the crusaders have been desperately searching for a way to obstruct the program which the Democrats had designed to improve the welfare and security of the people.

Early in the crusade, of course, the crusaders found that they could not fight the program head on; any direct efforts to deny people the much-needed schools, housing, highways, medical programs, etc., were answered by the people at the polls. Any lingering doubts which the Republicans might have had about this were dispelled by the elections of 1958.

However, never ones to be daunted by the expressed wishes of the people, Republican hucksters continued their search for a way to merchandise an obviously unattractive program. And early this year they finally hit on what is certainly the most effective packaging yet for their negative ideas. They decided that one way to fight the people's welfare programs would be to come up with something positive which the people could be

for (a balanced budget). But it might be even better, they decided, to come up with something scary which all the people could be against (inflation).

So they did both.

The first faint stirrings of a skillfully promoted and now mushrooming scare over inflation were heard last January and February when the President began holding press conferences at an unprecedented pace. (After his seventh consecutive conference, the Wall Street Journal, trying to contain its enthusiasm, remarked: "Not in nearly 5 years has Mr. Eisenhower held so many successive meetings with reporters.") The reason for Ike's sudden romance with the press soon became clear: He let it be known that despite the missile gap and the Berlin crisis, the one thing he wanted to talk about at his press conferences was inflation. Sooner or later would come one of his little sermons about the dangers of spending.

The next day, most of the Nation's editorial pages (and the following week such publications as Time and U.S. News) would translate his ambiguous sermons into a grammatically (if not economically) sound, continuing campaign against the Nation's newest scareword. As Don Campbell, business columnist for the Indianapolis Star, wrote: "Add to the Red peril and the yellow menace the name of inflation as one of the key bogeymen of the 1950's."

However, the Republican merchandisers were aware that press conference sermons were not enough. The Wall Street Journal and other papers reported that the President had also launched an all-out letterwriting campaign designed to drum up support for the fight-inflation drive. Secretary Seaton joined in (he was reported to have written about 100 letters) as well as Secretary Ezra Benson and Secretary Arthur Flemming.

The general theme of the letters was that everything must be done to support the President's budget because not to support it would lead to inflation. Most of the letters went to publishers asking for editorial support. As Ike put it: "Help in any way you think proper."

**NEEDED NO URGING**

Not that the publishers of most newspapers needed any urging. They had been printing editorials about economizing for years. But they were, no doubt, gratified at this new idea of fighting the welfare programs with the bogeyman inflation. And, no doubt, they were equally gratified that Eisenhower himself was finally going all out in an effort to block the Democratic programs—what the Republican press had helped put him in the White House to do anyway.

At the same time, the Republican national committee joined in the fight—although, considering the administration's failure to balance the budget or curb inflation, it is not clear just who or what the GOP was fighting. Nevertheless, the national committee, certain it had found an effective way to block Democratic programs, picked up the cry of "inflation" and began coming out with a few gimmicks of its own. An example: The committee made available to GOP Congressmen tapes for a canned radio interview with Budget Director Maurice Stans. The Congressman contributes his voice to the tape by asking Mr. Stans questions. For instance, the Congressman asks: "One final question, Mr. Stans. What can the average citizen do to help maintain a sound dollar and to fight inflation?"

Mr. Stans, in a reply already taped, says there are many things, such as recognizing "the fact that the more the programs that are urged upon the Congress, the more difficult it is to hold the line, and it is important that people not on the one hand ask for or insist on a balanced budget and on the other hand petition their Congressman



for new programs of spending of one kind and another."

In other words, the Republican Congressman, with Mr. Stans' help, is saying in effect: "Now folks, no matter how much you think we may need those new schools, or new highways, or to keep up with the Russians in guided missiles, remember if we have those things it will cause inflation and we all know how bad that would be—otherwise, why would Mr. Stans, speaking for the President, be so worried?"

When efforts to promote something reach the point where Congressmen are coming out urging the people not to write in requesting much-needed schools, low-cost housing, improved highways, and a crash missile program, it is high time to ask: Who is really behind this campaign? And the answer is not hard to find, as every day a new barrage of full-page, anti-inflation newspaper ads is fired at the American public.

The real hidden persuaders hiding behind Ike and his constant cry of inflation are the big corporations, the big bankers, and the big insurance companies. They have been spending thousands of dollars (which could well be going into taxes to help offset the Eisenhower budget deficit) on an all-out advertising campaign to establish a fear-of-inflation climate. For instance, Republic Steel, the Young & Rubicam Advertising Agency, the Institute of Life Insurance, and the American Iron and Steel Institute have all joined in the effort to wreck the public welfare programs by trying to frighten people to death with the threat of inflation. (For examples of what the status quo seekers have been saying in their ads see above.)

Other groups joined in: A Sound Dollar Committee was formed with headquarters in New York; the Chicago Tribune launched an all-out drive against inflation and asked the 21-State National Industrial Council to urge newspapers in other States to join the drive. (The Tribune also reported that from the golf course in Augusta, the President said he was following the drive with keen interest and congratulated the Tribune on its efforts.) The Advertising Council, public service unit of the advertising industry, was also approached for help. But the council is still undecided about what to do—partly because of the obviously political nature of the anti-inflation drive.

As Congressman CHESTER BOWLES, Democrat, of Connecticut, told a college news conference audience: "This has been an extraordinarily skillful publicity campaign. I have never seen anything to equal it." Although conceding that there are a lot of honest people genuinely concerned about inflation (including the President), BOWLES said: "There are a lot of other people who have been trying to stop public housing, depressed area bills, social security programs, and all the rest." Both these groups, BOWLES explained, "have joined arms in a great alliance and they have learned they can't lick housing and depressed area bills and social security by a frontal attack so they have tried a flanking attack, so they have equated public housing, urban development, social security, with inflation. It has been extremely skillful."

Meanwhile the hidden persuaders, who have been stirring up so much excitement about inflation, have been reaping the gains of higher interest rates and showing no inclination to lower prices, despite the record profits recorded in many industries. Just recently, for instance, United States Steel announced all-time high net profits for the first 6 months of the year: \$255 million. The same pattern held true for the other steel companies: Inland Steel reported a net income of \$42.1 million for the first 6 months of 1959—more than double the net income for the same period last year. (For record-setting prices see table below.)

But the steel companies continue to cry that they cannot meet labor's demands without further price increases—which would be inflationary. (The steel companies have in the past always raised prices after a wage settlement, usually two or three times more than would be necessary to offset the increased wage costs. For instance, according to a study made by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER's subcommittee, although the steel companies raised their prices \$6 a ton in 1957, "a reasonable guess as to the magnitude of increased labor costs which have arisen from the July 1957 adjustments in wages and other benefits falls somewhere between \$2.50 and \$3 per ton.")

Behind the inflation hysteria, of course, is hidden one of the most cynical political maneuvers in history: the attempt to discredit all Democratic efforts to initiate the much-needed domestic and military programs by reiterating the emotional, fear-ridden word "inflation." If the President were really scared of inflation he would be willing to listen occasionally to students of our economy other than the representatives of big banking and big business who make up his numerous bridge and golf foursomes. If he did, he might learn a few things about prices which his big banking and big business friends have failed to tell him—such as the fact that one of the greatest causes of inflation today is the increased interest rates which have helped drive prices up on every item which the consumer must purchase on credit; or the fact that many costs have been held up artificially by "administered prices"—a fact given impressive substantiation by industry's unusually high profits.

However, the President continues to listen only to representatives of big business. Consequently his idea of the way to fight inflation is to come out—as he did recently—against raising the minimum wage to \$1.25. But Ike never seems to show the same concern about raising the wages earned by bankers—which is what raising the interest rate amounts to. As Senator PAT McNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan, said: When Ike took office he must have taken two pledges of allegiance, one of which goes like this:

"I pledge allegiance to the banks,  
And to the benefits for which they stand,  
High interest, compounded  
With tremendous profits for all."

While many are beginning to recognize the great inflation conspiracy as a concerted effort by big business to block the people's welfare programs, Ike persists in seeing a

conspiracy working against the people. "I believe the public will soon realize . . ." the President said last February, defending his inadequate budget, "that we are engaged in a contest between the public interest and a wide array of special interests."

#### IKE'S SPECIAL INTERESTS

Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, replied: "If President Eisenhower's definition of 'special interest' is old folks who have to live in firetraps instead of safe nursing homes; colleges which have no place to house their students; people of low and middle incomes who need a decent place to live; cities full of slums breeding poverty and crime which want to clean out those slums, and veterans who are in need of homes, . . . then I want to urge the Democrats to continue to help those kinds of special interests."

Despite his campaign promises and despite 6 years in office in which he has done nothing to get at the real causes of inflation, the President continues to say: "By golly, we ought to do something about this inflation." Meanwhile, prices continue their upward creep. Recently the Bureau of Labor Statistics announced that at the end of June the consumer price index had reached an all-time high, 124.5. Everywhere, low- and middle-income families were feeling the pinch. "It is just like being pecked to death by gnats," a Los Angeles homeowner lamented to a Time correspondent.

Ironically, the people are beginning to see the swarm of gnats for what they really are, despite the gigantic campaign to make inflation a scareword to be used every time someone mentions a public need. Recently the Gallup Poll announced that in answer to the question: "Which political party . . . do you think is most interested in keeping prices down?" the majority answered, "the Democratic Party."

It is more than possible that of all the phony slogans which the great crusaders have run up the flagpole, the great "fight inflation" campaign will make the loudest backfire yet.

#### PROFITS OF 428 COMPANIES GAINED 75.6 PERCENT OVER A YEAR EARLIER IN SECOND QUARTER

The columns below show corporate profits reported for the second quarter of 1959, and those for the like quarter of 1958, with percentage changes, by groups. Where individual company reports cover 3-month periods other than calendar quarters, the nearest comparable periods have been used:

	2d quarter, 1959	2d quarter, 1958	Change from year ago
			Percent
10 Aircraft makers.....	\$7,208,000	\$18,892,000	-61.8
4 Airlines.....	13,786,000	13,156,000	+4.8
19 Autos and equipment.....	543,706,000	135,828,000	+300.1
21 Building materials.....	122,196,000	70,450,000	+73.4
14 Chainstores.....	33,707,000	31,023,000	+8.6
19 Chemicals.....	152,062,000	87,020,000	+74.7
12 Department stores.....	44,164,000	32,881,000	+34.3
5 Distillers.....	19,757,000	13,383,000	+47.6
9 Drug makers.....	26,891,000	23,649,000	+13.7
14 Electrical equipment.....	87,191,000	66,393,000	+31.3
7 Farm equipment.....	85,472,000	47,342,000	+80.5
16 Food products.....	51,200,000	51,067,000	+0.3
9 Mining and metals.....	52,939,000	23,717,000	+123.2
5 Office equipment.....	43,463,000	33,416,000	+30.1
15 Petroleum and products.....	386,482,000	308,823,000	+27.2
15 Pulp and paper.....	41,547,000	33,088,000	+25.6
9 Railway equipment.....	25,063,000	11,385,000	+102.6
8 Rubber companies.....	41,266,000	25,083,000	+64.5
21 Steel manufacturers.....	321,077,000	121,894,000	+163.4
12 Textiles.....	12,638,000	2,028,000	+524.2
8 Tobacco companies.....	57,293,000	50,162,000	+14.2
17 Tools and machinery.....	30,156,000	15,564,000	+93.7
97 Other companies.....	189,462,000	130,041,000	+45.7
Total, 366 industrials.....	2,386,726,000	1,341,285,000	+77.9
35 Railroads.....	147,583,000	59,286,000	+148.9
27 Utilities.....	119,554,000	110,622,000	+8.1
Grand total, 428 companies.....	2,653,863,000	1,511,193,000	+75.6

## Ceremony Honoring Speaker Thomas B. Reed

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. FRANK M. COFFIN**

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, this morning you very kindly participated with the Maine delegation in the House in a ceremony in the rotunda of the Old House Office Building, in which we presented a new stone pedestal to support the Gutzon Borglum bust of Thomas B. Reed, late Speaker of this body. This presentation fulfills a keen desire on the part of some of us who have long been irked by the hollow plywood base, simulated to look like marble, which has hitherto served as the pedestal for a bust of a noted son of Maine, carved by a noted sculptor. What irked us was not any real or fancied slight, but the un-Maine-like idea of applying cosmetic skill to make wood look like something else. We could tolerate solid wood that looked like wood, or solid stone that looked like stone, but not hollow wood with face of stone.

Speaker Reed himself looked like what he was—a large, hearty, vigorous, and courageous man. With the thought that the membership might be interested in some of the contributions of Speaker Reed, I am inserting the remarks I made at our little ceremony this morning:

Mr. Speaker and honored guests, on this occasion it may be appropriate to note that at one time Maine occupied a position in national politics comparable to that occupied by the State of Texas, today. We are here, today, to dedicate a new pedestal for the bust of Thomas Brackett Reed, Speaker of the House of Representatives in the 51st, 54th, and 55th Congresses. In his last two terms the President pro tempore of the Senate was Senator William P. Frye, of Maine, and Asher Hinds, of Maine, author of "Hinds' Precedents," was Parliamentarian in the House. A little earlier, the powerful combine of James G. Blaine, Nelson Dingley, Reed and Frye controlled the political fortunes in Maine and occupied central positions in the Republican Party on the national level. Then, Maine possessed five seats in the House of Representatives.

Today's dedication is a statewide affair. Speaker Reed represented the first district, Congressman OLIVER's constituency. The granite for the pedestal was quarried in Stonington, in Congressman McIntire's district. The cutting and finishing of the pedestal was done in my own district. We are paying tribute to a leader from our State and to the State itself.

Thomas Brackett Reed was born in Portland in 1839. A graduate of Bowdoin, he set out for the West to teach school and practice law in California. Apparently having seen all he wanted of that far land, he returned to his home State to make his career as representative and senator in the Maine State Legislature, attorney general, and finally Congressman from Maine's First District. He was first elected in 1876 and served continuously until 1899, when he resigned.

First nominated for the post of Speaker in 1885, Reed was elected to that post in 1889, when the Republicans controlled the 51st Congress. He was reelected in the 54th and 55th Congresses, resigning in September

1899, in disgust over the Spanish war and the annexation of Hawaii.

Speaker Reed is most noted for his contributions to majority rule in the House. As a member of the Rules Committee he had succeeded in ending filibustering on election cases, and on the tariff bill of 1883. His rules were adopted in the 51st Congress, dropped by the 52d, revived by the 53d, and restored by the 54th. They marked the first in the major steps toward modernization of House procedures and coincided with the compilation of the impressive "Hinds' Precedents."

In dedicating this monument to Thomas Brackett Reed, we are honoring a great line of Speakers who have brought the House to its present stature. Not the least of these greats is our present Speaker, the embodiment of tradition and respect for the need for democratic processes in our deliberations and actions. This pedestal is the product of the Maine coast, a symbol of integrity and an example of the craftsmanship which also marked the career of Thomas Brackett Reed.

I should mention, here, that we are indebted to the Deer Island Granite Co., of Stonington, Maine, and the James P. Murphy Co., of Lewiston, Maine, for the pedestal. They have donated this to the House of Representatives without any cost to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to present to you, for your library in Bonham, Tex., a simple and homely memento of Thomas Brackett Reed. This is a bootjack, designed for colder climes than yours, but suitable, I am sure, for removing the boots for which your State is famous. This was given by Mrs. Frances W. Spencer, owner of the Thomas B. Reed house in Portland, Maine. The jack belonged to Mr. Reed, and may serve as a reminder to all of us that even the mighty must stoop to jack a boot.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I thank you for your cooperation in this, as in so many other matters, and offer to you my own admiration and good wishes for your continued leadership in the House.

## The President's Veto of the Public Works Appropriation Bill

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. ELIZABETH KEE**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I was more than deeply distressed over the action of the President of the United States in vetoing the public works appropriation bill for fiscal 1960. In view of the fact that the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate appropriated funds for these flood control projects after full and complete study, and the fact that each project was found to be fully and completely justified, it is my earnest hope that the Congress of the United States will override the President's veto. Unless we are successful in our efforts, our American taxpaying citizens residing in these affected areas will continue to suffer unnecessary flood damages. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will continue to do all within my power to see that this measure is passed over the President's veto by the necessary two-thirds majority.

## Friendship Airport

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is an elementary proposition, universally acknowledged, that "justice delayed is justice denied."

The delays implicit in the judicial process were primarily responsible for the rise of administrative agencies. But today these administrative agencies are guilty of the same offense they were created to alleviate—delay in deciding cases.

As one of the elected Representatives from the great city of Baltimore, I rise to enter a vigorous and official protest concerning the unusual delay respecting the matter of Washington-Baltimore Adequacy of Service Investigation by the Civil Aeronautics Board, Docket No. 8148.

On May 3, 1956, a petition was filed requesting that the Civil Aeronautics Board investigate the inadequacy of service to the Greater Baltimore metropolitan area in accordance with sections 404 (a) and 1002 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended. The hearings in this matter were concluded on September 18, 1957, and I submit that there can be no justification for the continued delay of the issuance of an order from the Board. It is a well-known fact that in the period of over 3 years since the institution of an investigation for adequacy of service in the Baltimore area, this area has continued to receive far less service than it is legally entitled to. This condition continues in spite of the institution of jetplane service to the west coast by two airlines. By no stretch of the imagination can the institution of this service be construed as providing a pattern of service which is necessary to meet the test of "adequacy."

On July 31 of this year, I wrote to the Civil Aeronautics Board about this matter, so vital to the interests of the large population of Greater Baltimore. In reply the CAB stated:

We agree wholeheartedly with your statement in your letter of July 31 as to the need for a prompt decision in our Baltimore-Washington adequacy-of-service case. Let us assure you that we are striving to make our findings, based on a very ponderous record, as quickly as possible.

As you are aware, and as the record before us makes so clear, the issues in this complex proceeding are of considerable economic consequence to the airlines and to the public. We feel that the fairness and soundness of our decision are equally as important as its promptness.

In addition, scores of matters of many types must be given attention by the Board so that we do not find ourselves able to devote the continuous hours to this case which would be desirable. We have had, for instance, the Northeastern States area investigation before us in which we recently voted tentative approval for service between Washington, Baltimore, and Boston via Allegheny Airlines.



Acknowledging that the record may be ponderous, certainly sufficient time has elapsed since November 7, 1958, when oral arguments were completed, for a decision to have been reached.

As to the "scores of matters of many types [which] must be given attention by the Board so that [they] do not find themselves able to devote the continuous hours to this case which would be desirable," does the Board expect its case-load to lighten? Is it hoping for a slack period in order to devote time to this case? Or is the Board merely offering weak excuses for failure to have performed its function?

Obviously the reasons ascribed do not justify the delay.

The people of Baltimore erected a truly magnificent airport in 1950. The Friendship International Airport was immediately hailed as one of the truly excellent facilities in the world, especially due to the fact that when this airport was planned, the use of fast jet planes was clearly envisioned.

I should like to point out that the CAB's own examiner estimated that well over 75,000 Baltimoreans are obliged to travel to and from Washington's National Airport each year. This proves conclusively that Baltimore does have the present potential of adequate numbers of passengers that desire to travel by air. Also, recent figures of passenger service at Friendship reveal a 36 percent increase over last year—additional and conclusive proof that when the service is here, the passengers are, too.

On August 14, 1959, I again wrote to the Civil Aeronautics Board that I could not understand the reason for the long delay in reaching a decision in this particular case. As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives, I feel that if a decision is not reached by the CAB within a reasonable time, an investigation and searching inquiry would be indicated respecting this matter. The urgent needs of almost 2 million of our citizens must be given due and proper recognition.

**Maj. Gen. William P. Fisher**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

**HON. WILLIAM E. HESS**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to one of the distinguished military officers on the Washington scene who is soon to leave. Maj. Gen. William P. Fisher, the Air Force Director of Legislative Liaison, is to become in a few weeks the Commander, Eastern Transport Air Force, Military Air Transport Service at McGuire Air Force Base, N.J.

Bill Fisher is an airman for whom I have great respect and admiration. He was born the son of a Congregational minister in Atlanta, Ga. He grew up in

Southern Pines, N.C. He graduated as an engineer from North Carolina State College in 1934 after a 2-year interruption of his education to work. He then became a flying cadet in the Army Air Corps. After completion of his flying training he competed for a Regular Army commission which he won in October 1936.

On December 7, 1941, Bill Fisher, then a major of 2 days' standing, was wounded in the Japanese attack on Clark Field in the Philippines. His airplane out of action, he led his squadron, the 28th Bombardment Squadron of the famous 19th Bombardment Group, as it fought on the ground as an infantry unit. But he was soon back in the air fighting the Japanese from Java. After a short interval in the States, he returned to the war as a colonel in command of the 308th Bombardment Group under Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault in China.

During the Korean conflict Bill Fisher commanded the Far East Air Forces Bomber Command until assigned as Inspector General of the Strategic Air Command. He came to his Washington assignment in Air Force Legislative Liaison from the post of Deputy Commander, 8th Air Force.

That firm determination and immense ability which made him a great combat air commander has made him unusually effective as the Director of the Air Force's legislative liaison activities. He has represented the Air Force most ably in its relations with the Congress during the past session. I am convinced he will continue to do big things for the Air Force and the Nation in his new post. I am sure that I speak for the Congress when I wish Bill Fisher every good wish for continued success.

### Aid for Redevelopment of Depressed Economic Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

**HON. ELIZABETH KEE**

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to make one more plea before Congress adjourns for action by the the House on legislation to set up a program of cooperative Federal-State aid for the redevelopment of depressed economic areas.

Many sections of our Nation are suffering from persistent and substantial unemployment. This is a serious problem that time will not solve. Nor will it go away if we simply close our eyes to it.

These depressed areas need help, Mr. Speaker. They must be given assistance in rebuilding their economy and in attracting new industry that will create permanent jobs.

The Senate has passed an area redevelopment bill. The House Banking and Currency Committee approved a bill last May. The bill is still pending in the House Rules Committee.

If Congress adjourns without acting on this legislation, Congress will have to face up to this problem next year. We cannot escape it.

Mr. Speaker, it is unthinkable that in times of unprecedented prosperity for the country as a whole we will permit large pockets of depression to exist.

The people in these areas are suffering. Hundreds of thousands of them depend upon gifts of surplus foods to feed their families. They need help—not handouts to keep their children from starving but jobs which will enable them to support their families and lead useful, fruitful lives.

### Newsletter of the Honorable James Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

**HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from my distinguished colleague and friend, Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, to his constituents. What Representative ROOSEVELT has to say in his letter is most worthwhile, and I commend it to the attention of my fellow Members:

AUGUST 1959.

DEAR FRIENDS AND CONSTITUENTS: Since I last wrote to you, the Landrum-Griffin labor bill has been passed by the House, and, thus, almost 6 months of hard work in the labor-management field has gone right out the window. The Landrum-Griffin bill, apparently originally written by Senator GOLDWATER, of Arizona, is a bad bill, which was put over by the systematic distribution of hokum through virtually all our channels of communication.

For months we have been subjected to a steady drumbeat of propaganda about the need for a "strong" labor bill, which rose to crescendo with Mr. Eisenhower's impassioned radio and TV appeal for the Griffin-Landrum bill. Throughout this long campaign the technique was identical—first a recitation of the evils discovered by the McClellan committee and then the plug for a "strong" bill, thus leading the reader or the viewer to believe that what was meant by a "strong" bill was a bill that would oust the racketeers and thieves and clean out the corruption.

Actually, nothing could have been further from the truth. What the administration and the Republican leadership and some of the southern Democrats and the National Association of Manufacturers and all their assorted payrollers and mouthpieces meant by a "strong labor bill" was a bill that would contain amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act solely calculated to cripple and penalize perfectly honest, legitimate unions. It was simply a situation in which an old-fashioned, all-out, NAM union-busting drive was being cloaked by a sanctimonious plea for ousting the racketeers.

If you have any doubt about this, just read the three bills that the House fought over: the Landrum-Griffin bill, the Elliott bill, and the Shelley bill, or as it is sometimes called, the Shelley-Roosevelt bill. You will find that in the areas where the McClellan committee recommended that ac-

tion be taken, the three bills are virtually identical, except that the Shelley bill extended its penalties to employers and labor brokers as well as union officials. In other words, the Shelley bill hit everybody that was in any way concerned in labor racketeering or stealing or illegal profiteering at the expense of the worker.

But, because the Shelley bill was an honest, straightforward attempt to correct the abuses found by the Senate committee, and because it did not attempt to use these abuses as an excuse for undercutting legitimate union activity, and because it contained no sly, antiunion phraseology—it was labeled the “weakest” bill; whereas, the Landrum bill, which did not cover nearly the ground that the Shelley bill did in the area of corruption, but which did contain provisions extremely damaging to honest labor activity, was labeled the “strongest” bill and plugged for by everybody from Mr. Eisenhower to the lowliest NAM lobbyist in an all-out, and apparently successful, drive to convince the country that the “strong” bill was strong in the sense of protecting the worker.

Such are the uses of propaganda, and Lord help us all if we don't learn to distinguish between truth and hokum before Madison Avenue swamps us completely in syndicated piffle.

Exactly the same applies to the anguished caterwauling about inflation that emanates from the White House every time Congress considers any type of bill that might possibly do the general public some good. If you spend a dime for a general improvement, says the administration, you add to the perils of inflation. And if you build a school or aid a housing program or add a couple of dollars to a pension to enable somebody to stay alive, then you have breached the dam irretrievably and allowed the floodwaters of inflation to sweep everything before them.

Probably no sillier thesis was ever maintained by presumably sane men but this administration, aided by its corps of publicity experts, is making a lot of people believe it. Meantime, the same administration, having successfully diverted the public attention by yelling about public extravagance, shovels money to the bankers with both hands by progressively raising Federal Reserve interest rates and fighting to raise interest rates on Government bonds.

This is the basic source of inflation and high prices that are hitting us from all sides. Interest rates are raised to primary borrowers, who, in turn, raise rates to secondary borrowers; eventually, the bank rates become too high and less and less money is borrowed for purposes of plant expansion and new products, with the result that new jobs do not open up, new products are not made, and the gross national product is thus arbitrarily limited to approximately what is being produced at the time. But, since the population continues to grow and the demand is consequently ever greater, the price of existing goods goes up and up while profits rise fantastically, the rich get richer, the poor get poorer, and the pensioner has to sleep under a bridge.

My friends, it's time to wake up. This is a bad administration, the like of which we haven't seen since the twenties and which will inevitably wind up in the same place the Coolidge-Hoover regimes did, because it is traveling the same road. When a government pursues a steady policy of squeezing the small businessman and the worker and beating the unions over the head in order that the banker may sit on bigger and bigger bags of money and charge more and more for the use of some of it, that government is going to wind up in an economic crash, no matter how loudly it meanwhile screams about an inflation that it is

itself creating and tries to blame it on unions and spenders. We're heading that way fast.

Fortunately, 1960 isn't far off, but even so, I sometimes wonder if it will get here in time. When it does come, we'd better not fumble it.

Since my last letter, the housing bill has been vetoed, as I said it probably would be. It was perfectly logical that it should be vetoed because it would have helped a considerable number of people and it was not written for the exclusive benefit of the bankers. So it got the ax, with the routine explanation that it was “inflationary.” The charge was so preposterous and the veto so indefensible that when Senator SPARKMAN held hearings on it, he couldn't even find a member of the executive staff who would admit having written the veto message. We've gotten pretty well used to government by proxy since 1953, but this was the first time anybody had heard of government by pixie.

I have been appointed by Chairman SHEPARD of the California congressional delegation, to head a bipartisan delegation committee which will look into the matter of the flood of narcotics which is apparently coming over the Mexican border. Our duties will consist of determining the areas of responsibility so that the proper committees may conduct the necessary investigations and see to it that the necessary liaisons are effected with the proper Mexican officials. We are getting excellent cooperation from both State and Federal officers, all of whom are as anxious as we are to solve the problem speedily. The first hearings will probably be held this month.

Congress is expected to adjourn before too long and it will be good to get home and see you again. Meantime, all best wishes.

Sincerely,

JAMES ROOSEVELT.

### Address by Vice President Richard M. Nixon at American Legion Convention

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, a current topic of interest, and of great debate throughout our good country, is the approaching visit of Nikita Khrushchev.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an excellent speech by Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON at the convention of the American Legion in Minneapolis, Minn., last week:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE 41ST NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., AUGUST 25, 1959

I recognize that there are a substantial number of Americans in this audience and throughout the Nation who are deeply concerned about the visit of Mr. Khrushchev to the United States. There are many who believe that no good and much harm can come from such a visit.

There is no question but that there are minus as well as plus factors in appraising the possible results of the Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchange of visits. On balance, I believe the decision to invite Mr. Khrushchev to come to the United States was correct.

In indicating my reasons for reaching this conclusion, may I first remind you of the background from which I speak. I have made a comprehensive study of the philosophy, tactics and strategy of communism as set forth by Marx, Lenin, Stalin and other Communist leaders. On the basis of those studies, I know that Communists throughout the world are united in working for one objective—Communist rule over all the people of the world.

I know from experience that the Communist Party in the United States, like all Communist parties throughout the world, is directed and controlled from Moscow and has in the past and will in the future engage in espionage and subversion in order to serve the interests of Communist governments wherever they are opposed to those of the United States or other free nations. And I can vividly recall that it was just a little over a year ago Communist-led mobs made an unsuccessful attempt on my life in Venezuela.

I have just returned from the Soviet Union where I have had the opportunity to speak at length with Mr. Khrushchev and to appraise the present tactics and strategy of the world Communist movement. On the basis of that visit, I can say unequivocally that the only significant change in Communist tactics since the death of Stalin is that Mr. Khrushchev and other Communist leaders now say they will accomplish their objective of world domination without resort to war.

Subversion and espionage in the United States and other non-Communist countries continue to be directed and supported by the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. The rigid positions of the Soviet Government on such issues as Berlin, disarmament, setting up an inspection system for prevention of surprise attack, and ending atomic tests, are the same now as they were before these visits were announced.

It would be naive and wishful thinking to assume that the visit of Mr. Khrushchev to the United States will result in any basic change in the Communist objective of world domination or their adherence to policies designed to achieve that goal.

We should be under no illusions that Mr. Khrushchev's belief in the superiority of the Communist system will be changed in any significant respect by his seeing the great productivity of the American economy. Everything he sees in the United States will be seen through Communist eyes and the picture will be distorted or magnified so that it fits into the rigid description of free societies which the Communist doctrine has painted for over 100 years.

Nor should we be under any illusions that better understanding between the Soviet leaders and ourselves is all that is needed to resolve our differences and to assure peace. There are some deep and basic conflicts of interest and ideology which all the good will and mutual understanding in the world will not settle. Charm, words of friendship, gracious toasts, are not going to have the slightest effect in deterring Mr. Khrushchev from his basic objectives.

What useful purpose then will this visit serve? Putting it in its simplest terms, while understanding alone will not bring peace, misunderstanding could provoke war. And it is because his visit can serve to reduce the possibilities of such misunderstanding that it could contribute to the chance that we can settle our differences without war and, therefore, deserves the approval of the American people.

What does Mr. Khrushchev really believe about the United States and the free world?

Based on my conversations with him and my analysis of the statements he has made, publicly and privately, through the years, here is a thumbnail sketch of a man who holds in his hands the greatest power any one man has ever held in the history of



civilization—who by his decision alone could press the button which could start a chain reaction which would destroy civilization as we know it.

First, here are some things he believes which are true. He is aware of the fact that the United States has great military strength. While he constantly boasts of his superiority in the missile field, he has publicly stated in his speech at Dnepropetrovsk on July 28 that no nation today can initiate a war without suffering terrible destruction in return.

He knows the United States is a rich country economically with a high standard of living. He has paid us the compliment of setting as the Soviet goal, catching up with and passing the United States in the production of consumer goods.

I believe he is convinced that President Eisenhower is a man who wants peace and who insists that the United States remain strong only because he believes this is the way to keep peace.

But he also has some dangerous misconceptions about the United States and the free world which, in the mind of a man with such awesome power in his hands, constitute a terrible risk to the peace of the world.

Here are some of the things he presently believes about us and our policies:

"Freedom in the United States exists only for those who have money and power and not for the working people.

"Capitalists in the United States have turned the society in which they rule into a paradise for the rich and a hell for the poor—a kingdom of the dollar, of harsh exploitation of millions of people to enrich a handful of monopolists.

"In the United States and other free countries the working people are given the right to vote for various representatives of the ruling class but have no right to participate in the work of the legislative bodies.

"However, beautifully the ideologists of imperialism may dress up the capitalist system, it still remains a system by which millions of people are enslaved by a comparatively small handful of exploiters, a system in which poverty and mass unemployment reign."

The words I have just quoted are not mine but his, taken directly from his public statements. And these ideas he reiterated to me in my conversations with him. Because he believes these things he has reached other conclusions which he has stated to me and to others who have talked with him; that millions of people in the United States do not support the President in his firm stand against Communist aggression; that both of our major political parties are controlled by a few rich monopolists and are not responsive to the will of the people; that our economy has reached its peak and is on the way down; that the nations of the free world alliance are divided and when the chips are down will not unite in resisting aggression.

Put yourself in his place. If you possessed great military strength with uncontrolled and absolute power to use that strength to accomplish your purposes; if also you were fanatically dedicated to the philosophy that your economic and political system should and would rule the world; and if in addition you believed you were confronted by opponents who were divided and who lacked the will to resist aggression, would you not be tempted to be far more aggressive in your policies than if you had other ideas as to the strength and will to resist of those who might oppose your aims?

Mr. Khrushchev will be here for only a relatively brief time, but, in his conversations with President Eisenhower and in his trip across the country, there is no doubt in my mind but that he will see and hear some things which will change his preconceived notions about the United States and which

in turn will give him pause before he embarks on a course of action in the future which might be contrary to our vital interests.

He will find that not only are we strong militarily and economically, but that the American people have the will to use their strength to defend our freedom or the freedom of others any place in the world. He will find that the overwhelming majority of the American people are as dedicated to our system as he is to his. He will find that we will no more tolerate being pushed around than will he.

In a nutshell, if we are to have a Soviet leader with such power in his hands, it is better to have one who knows the world than one who is isolated in the Kremlin.

But what about the dangers of such a visit? There are some who fear that the American people will be lulled into a false sense of security and trust by this exchange. I think that those who believe this to be the case underestimate the intelligence of both our people and our leaders.

It is true that throughout American history we have a record of being a trusting and forgiving people in our relations with other people, but it is also true that we are a people who do not like our trust betrayed and when it is we react accordingly.

When President Eisenhower meets Mr. Khrushchev, you can be sure he will have in mind: The record of major treaties and agreements broken by the Soviet Government—50 out of 52 since 1933; the fact that subversive activities against the United States and the governments of other free nations continue despite Soviet protestations to the contrary. There will be fresh in his memory the fact that Mr. Khrushchev failed to carry out the commitments made at the last Geneva Conference and instead encouraged and stimulated Communist probing actions against the free world in the Middle East and the Far East. And if there was any doubt that we would go into this conference with our eyes open, the Soviet Government's support of the Communist forces in Laos provides a grim and timely warning of what we should expect.

I have had the rare opportunity of seeing both Mr. Khrushchev and President Eisenhower in action both publicly and privately, and I can assure you that the fears of those who believe that President Eisenhower may be taken in or bluffed by Mr. Khrushchev are completely without foundation. There is no doubt whatever but that the interest of the United States and the free world will be vigorously, firmly, and aggressively represented by the President in this meeting.

Another objection to the visit is the possible effect on our allies. The President's trip to Bonn, Paris, and London, provides a complete answer to this objection. As the President has made abundantly clear, it is not the American way to negotiate, in the absence of our allies, problems that vitally concern their future. We reject the concept that two great powers—the United States and the U.S.S.R.—should decide the fate of other peoples without consultation with them.

A major objection to the visit is the effect it may have on the captive peoples of Eastern Europe. You can be sure, however, that under no circumstances will this exchange of visits result in statements or actions on the part of the United States indicating our approval or acquiescence in the status of the peoples of Eastern Europe.

We do not question the right of the people of these countries, or any other for that matter, to have a Socialist or Communist government if they so desire. But we believe that all people should have a right to choose the kind of government they want. The

people of the satellite nations of Eastern Europe have never had an opportunity to exercise that right since World War II. We recognize that their right of choice cannot be obtained by armed intervention on our part. A so-called war of liberation would liberate only dead bodies and ruined cities. But we will continue to support through peaceful means realization of the objective that the peoples of these satellite countries be given the opportunity to choose the kind of government they want.

I believe that the American people should give Mr. Khrushchev a courteous reception when he visits the United States. I do not suggest this because I believe a courteous reception is going to affect, one way or the other, his ideas about our system, but because this is the American way of doing things. Visitors in our country, regardless of how much we disagree with them, should not be subjected to the rowdiness and riots for which the Communists were responsible when I was in South America.

The discussions President Eisenhower will have with Mr. Khrushchev, involving as they do such basic differences and conflict of interest, will be difficult at best. In the cause of the peace with justice that we all want, let us by our conduct see that those discussions are conducted in the best possible climate.

### The Carey Letter

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

#### HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

#### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, as did many of my colleagues last week, I received an intemperate, threatening letter from a prominent labor official criticizing my vote on the Landrum-Griffin substitute labor reform bill. I refer to James B. Carey, president of the powerful International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO. I incorporate his letter in my remarks at this point:

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL,  
RADIO, AND MACHINE WORKERS,  
August 18, 1959.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: Only you know, in the privacy of your own conscience, whether you carefully considered the possible consequences of the Landrum-Griffin bill when you voted for it on August 13, 1959. If you did, and realized that it is a punitive, repressive measure intended to weaken all labor unions and thereby all working men and women, you have much to answer for. If you did not, and merely yielded to the pressures of the chamber of commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, your guilt is perhaps even greater.

You should realize now, if you did not during the heat of battle, that this vindictive assault on the labor movement will, in the long run, prove to your constituents that you are less interested in individual rights and democracy than in property rights and the concentration of power in the hands of big business.

You may believe that you are safe in such action because organized labor is relatively weak in your district, and cannot call you to account for the damage you have sought to do to it. You may be right—at the moment.

We wish to assure you, however, that we shall do all in our power to prove to the

working men and women in your district that you have cast your lot against them and they should therefore take appropriate action at the ballot box.

Very truly yours,

JAMES B. CAREY,  
President.

Now, generally, I find it hard to simulate much enthusiasm for a mimeographed or multigraphed form letter, but I read Mr. Carey's missive with considerable care and replied to him as follows:  
AUGUST 26, 1959.

Mr. JAMES B. CAREY,  
President, International Union of Electrical,  
Radio and Machine Workers, Wash-  
ington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. CAREY: I have your form letter of August 18, 1959, a copy of which I understand was sent to all my colleagues who voted for the Landrum-Griffin version of the labor-management reform bill.

Neither your intemperate characterizations, your threat to get me nor your erroneous assumptions concerning my study of the measure impress me as worthy of a high official of a powerful labor organization.

No representative of the National Association of Manufacturers or the chamber of commerce "pressured" me or even contacted me. I believe, however, in the right of petition and would have welcomed their views as I did those of six officials of the Teamsters Union and three officials of building trades unions with whom I discussed at some length the differing provisions of the various proposals.

I heard nothing from you or your union—but would have welcomed any proof you could submit—as I requested of the other union officials—that specific language in any of the various bills would hamper legitimate organizational and collective bargaining activities of unions. My conception of the duty of a legislator requires more than simply voting by labels or adjectives unsupported by fact and logic.

Requiring democratic procedures and honesty in handling funds in labor organizations cannot possibly harm the rank-and-file union member, though it may well curb dictatorial officials insensitive to their position of trust with respect to the rights and the funds of those they represent. Shielding innocent third parties, managers, employees and consumers, from being drawn into someone else's labor dispute and preventing "sweetheart" contracts and representation not actually desired by the free choice of employees are reforms demonstrated by the McClellan committee investigations to be necessary and should not impair legitimate union activities.

Consequently, it is a misrepresentation to describe legislation designed to achieve these goals and no other as "punitive," "repressive" or "killer" legislation.

I believe my colleagues, like myself, are far more likely to be impressed by logic than by threats.

To assist in advising the working men and women of my district on this very important issue, I will be happy to send a copy of your letter and of this reply to anyone living in the Second Congressional District of Michigan whose name and address you furnish me.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

Mr. Speaker, as one might expect, Mr. Carey's threats did not go unnoticed by the public. As an example I include at this point an interesting commentary from the August 23, 1959, edition of the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot:

#### JAMES CAREY'S MISTAKE

Leaders of organized labor in America apparently have become panicky since their defeat on the Landrum-Griffin bill in the House.

CV—1078

And men in that state of mind are likely to make mistakes.

That is probably what James B. Carey, AFL-CIO vice president, did with his "we'll-get-you" letters to Members of the House who voted for the labor bill.

The action is all the more strange because there are precedents which prove that the tactics are wrong.

Labor was unable to defeat the Taft-Hartley bill, even with all the pressure that was applied and with a veto by former President Harry S. Truman.

After the debacle, labor took after the late Senator Robert A. Taft, throwing all of its power into an effort to "get" him.

The result was the greatest political victory in the Ohio Senator's career. The opposition of labor almost made him President.

More recently, the passage of the Landrum-Griffin bill in the House showed the ineffectiveness of the Carey type of politics.

Labor lobbyists swarmed over the Capitol, applying all the pressure they could. They lost because the people rallied behind the controversial measure.

It is likely that many of the Congressmen followed the wishes of their constituents with some misgivings. They know that the voice of the people is loud, when it is heard, but that the public generally will not remain "steamed up" over a given issue for any great length of time; that to the men who work at politics every day in the year can be very effective.

That is why traditional politicians fade out of sight when hit by a successful reform movement. They carefully avoid stirring up any controversy until the reformers lose interest.

Thus Carey's letters handed the Congressmen exactly the ammunition they need to rally support when they come up for reelection. The letters will be carefully preserved to be brought out at campaign time to remind the people that their will prevailed.

And if Carey goes through with his threat to punish "labor's enemies" he will reelect a lot of men who voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Carey threatens to "do all in our power to prove to the working men and women" in my congressional district, the second of Michigan, that I have cast my "lot against them" and that "they should therefore take appropriate action at the ballot box." That, of course, means he must conduct an educational campaign.

In my letter, I offered to assist him, by sending a copy of his letter and a copy of my reply to any residents of my district for whom he would furnish names and addresses.

### Vice President Nixon's Address on Khrushchev Visit, Given at American Legion National Convention in Minneapolis

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from the address given by Vice President RICHARD

M. NIXON on August 25, 1959, before the 41st National Convention of the American Legion in Minneapolis, Minn. Mr. Nixon dealt forthrightly with the Khrushchev visits—and how we should conduct ourselves, correctly civil and without demonstrations, in order, if possible, to convince the Communist dictator that the American people and their Government are strong, resolute, and united in opposition to his plans for achieving world domination by force or otherwise:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE 41ST NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., AUGUST 25, 1959

I recognize that there are a substantial number of Americans in this audience and throughout the Nation who are deeply concerned about the visit of Mr. Khrushchev to the United States. There are many who believe that no good and much harm can come from such a visit.

There is no question but that there are minus as well as plus factors in appraising the possible results of the Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchange of visits. On balance, I believe the decision to invite Mr. Khrushchev to come to the United States was correct.

In indicating my reasons for reaching this conclusion, may I first remind you of the background from which I speak. I have made a comprehensive study of the philosophy, tactics, and strategy of communism as set forth by Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and other Communist leaders. On the basis of those studies, I know that Communists throughout the world are united in working for one objective, Communist rule over all the people of the world.

I know from experience that the Communist Party in the United States, like all Communist Parties throughout the world, is directed and controlled from Moscow and has in the past and will in the future engage in espionage and subversion in order to serve the interests of Communist governments wherever they are opposed to those of the United States or other free nations. And I can vividly recall that it was just a little over a year ago Communist-led mobs made an unsuccessful attempt on my life in Venezuela.

I have just returned from the Soviet Union where I have had the opportunity to speak at length with Mr. Khrushchev and to appraise the present tactics and strategy of the world Communist movement. On the basis of that visit, I can say unequivocally that the only significant change in Communist tactics since the death of Stalin is that Mr. Khrushchev and other Communist leaders now say they will accomplish their objective of world domination without resort to war.

Subversion and espionage in the United States and other non-Communist countries continue to be directed and supported by the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. The rigid positions of the Soviet Government on such issues as Berlin, disarmament, setting up an inspection system for prevention of surprise attack, and ending atomic tests, are the same now as they were before these visits were announced.

It would be naive and wishful thinking to assume that the visit of Mr. Khrushchev to the United States will result in any basic change in the Communist objective of world domination or their adherence to policies designed to achieve that goal.

We should be under no illusions that Mr. Khrushchev's belief in the superiority of the Communist system will be changed in any significant respect by his seeing the great productivity of the American economy. Everything he sees in the United States will be seen through Communist eyes and the picture will be distorted or magnified so that



it fits into the rigid description of free societies which the Communist doctrine has painted for over 100 years.

Nor should we be under any illusions that better understanding between the Soviet leaders and ourselves is all that is needed to resolve our differences and to assure peace. There are some deep and basic conflicts of interest and ideology which all the good will and mutual understanding in the world will not settle. Charm, words of friendship, gracious toasts, are not going to have the slightest effect in deterring Mr. Khrushchev from his basic objectives.

What useful purpose then will this visit serve? Putting it in its simplest terms, while understanding alone will not bring peace, misunderstanding could provoke war. And it is because his visit can serve to reduce the possibilities of such misunderstanding that it could contribute to the chance that we can settle our differences without war and, therefore, deserves the approval of the American people.

What does Mr. Khrushchev really believe about the United States and the free world?

Based on my conversations with him and my analysis of the statements he has made, publicly and privately, through the years, here is a thumbnail sketch of a man who holds in his hands the greatest power any one man has ever held in the history of civilization—who by his decision alone could press the button which could start a chain reaction which would destroy civilization as we know it.

First, here are some things he believes which are true. He is aware of the fact that the United States has great military strength. While he constantly boasts of his superiority in the missile field, he has publicly stated in his speech at Dnepropetrovsk on July 28 that no nation today can initiate a war without suffering terrible destruction in return.

He knows the United States is a rich country economically with a high standard of living. He has paid us the compliment of setting as the Soviet goal catching up with and passing the United States in the production of consumer goods.

I believe he is convinced that President Eisenhower is a man who wants peace and who insists that the United States remain strong only because he believes this is the way to keep peace.

But he also has some dangerous misconceptions about the United States and the free world which, in the mind of a man with such awesome power in his hands, constitute a terrible risk to the peace of the world.

Here are some of the things he presently believes about us and our policies:

"Freedom in the United States exists only for those who have money and power and not for the working people."

"Capitalists in the United States have turned the society in which they rule into a paradise for the rich and a hell for the poor—a kingdom of the dollar, of harsh exploitation of millions of people to enrich a handful of monopolists."

"In the United States and other free countries the working people are given the right to vote for various representatives of the ruling class but have no right to participate in the work of the legislative bodies."

"However beautifully the ideologists of imperialism may dress up the capitalist system, it still remains a system by which millions of people are enslaved by a comparatively small handful of exploiters, a system in which poverty and mass unemployment reign."

The words I have just quoted are not mine but his—taken directly from his public statements. And these ideas he reiterated to me in my conversations with him. Because he believes these things he has reached other conclusions which he has stated to me and to others who have talked with him: that millions of people in the United States

do not support the President in his firm stand against Communist aggression; that both of our major political parties are controlled by a few rich monopolists and are not responsive to the will of the people; that our economy has reached its peak and is on the way down; that the nations of the free world alliance are divided and when the chips are down will not unite in resisting aggression.

Put yourself in his place. If you possessed great military strength with uncontrolled and absolute power to use that strength to accomplish your purposes; if also you were fanatically dedicated to the philosophy that your economic and political system should and would rule the world; and if in addition you believed you were confronted by opponents who were divided and who lacked the will to resist aggression, would you not be tempted to be far more aggressive in your policies than if you had other ideas as to the strength and will to resist of those who might oppose your aims?

Mr. Khrushchev will be here for only a relatively brief time, but, in his conversations with President Eisenhower and in his trip across the country, there is no doubt in my mind but that he will see and hear some things which will change his preconceived notions about the United States and which in turn will give him pause before he embarks on a course of action in the future which might be contrary to our vital interests.

He will find that not only are we strong militarily and economically, but that the American people have the will to use their strength to defend our freedom or the freedom of others any place in the world. He will find that the overwhelming majority of the American people are as dedicated to our system as he is to his. He will find that we will no more tolerate being pushed around than will he.

In a nutshell, if we are to have a Soviet leader with such power in his hands, it is better to have one who knows the world than one who is isolated in the Kremlin.

But what about the dangers of such a visit? There are some who fear that the American people will be lulled into a false sense of security and trust by this exchange. I think that those who believe this to be the case underestimate the intelligence of both our people and our leaders.

It is true that throughout American history we have a record of being a trusting and forgiving people in our relations with other people, but it is also true that we are a people who do not like our trust betrayed and when it is we react accordingly.

When President Eisenhower meets Mr. Khrushchev, you can be sure he will have in mind: The record of major treaties and agreements broken by the Soviet Government—50 out of 52 since 1933; the fact that subversive activities against the United States and the governments of other free nations continue despite Soviet protestations to the contrary. There will be fresh in his memory the fact that Mr. Khrushchev failed to carry out the commitments made at the last Geneva Conference and instead encouraged and stimulated Communist probing actions against the free world in the Middle East and the Far East. And if there was any doubt that we would go into this conference with our eyes open, the Soviet Government's support of the Communist forces in Laos provides a grim and timely warning of what we should expect.

I have had the rare opportunity of seeing both Mr. Khrushchev and President Eisenhower in action both publicly and privately, and I can assure you that the fears of those who believe that President Eisenhower may be taken in or bluffed by Mr. Khrushchev are completely without foundation. There is no doubt whatever but that the interests of the United States and the free world will

be vigorously, firmly and aggressively represented by the President in this meeting.

Another objection to the visit is the possible effect on our allies. The President's trip to Bonn, Paris, and London provides a complete answer to this objection. As the President has made abundantly clear, it is not the American way to negotiate, in the absence of our allies, problems that vitally concern their future. We reject the concept that two great powers—the United States and the U.S.S.R.—should decide the fate of other peoples without consultation with them.

A major objection to the visit is the effect it may have on the captive peoples of Eastern Europe. You can be sure, however, that under no circumstances will this exchange of visits result in statements or actions on the part of the United States indicating our approval or acquiescence in the status of the peoples of Eastern Europe.

We do not question the right of the people of these countries, or any other for that matter, to have a Socialist or Communist government if they so desire. But we believe that all people should have a right to choose the kind of government they want. The people of the satellite nations of Eastern Europe have never had an opportunity to exercise that right since World War II. We recognize that their right of choice cannot be obtained by armed intervention on our part. A so-called war of liberation would liberate only dead bodies and ruined cities. But we will continue to support through peaceful means realization of the objectives that the peoples of these satellite countries be given the opportunity to choose the kind of government they want.

I believe that the American people should give Mr. Khrushchev a courteous reception when he visits the United States. I do not suggest this because I believe a courteous reception is going to affect one way or the other his ideas about our system, but because this is the American way of doing things. Visitors in our country, regardless of how much we disagree with them, should not be subjected to the rowdiness and riots for which the Communists were responsible when I was in South America.

The discussions President Eisenhower will have with Mr. Khrushchev, involving as they do such basic differences and conflict of interest, will be difficult at best. In the cause of the peace with justice that we all want, let us by our conduct see that those discussions are conducted in the best possible climate.

## Labor Legislation

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

### HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, before leaving on an official trip to London where I am scheduled to address the Congress of the International Astronautical Federation early in September in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Cooperation and Security of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I want to reiterate my views on labor legislation as considered by the House.

During the discussions on the floor of the House, I stated that it was most unfair to strike at legitimate unionism and to foreclose the rights of working people

which required many years of hard work and determination to achieve. It was my feeling that enactment of the Landrum-Griffin bill would be a decided step in the direction of outlawing or controlling labor because many of labor's rights are denied in that bill. For that reason I voted against the Landrum-Griffin bill.

It was also my view that political motives were behind the effort to adopt the Landrum-Griffin bill, and I could not see the logic or reasoning in making a political football out of the bread-and-butter problem of millions of Americans.

I also opposed the bill because it was a piece of legislation which struck blindly at labor, the guilty and the innocent alike, the racketeers and those seeking to eliminate racketeering. This is a wrong approach. We must not throw all of labor into the discard or cast shadows of doubt upon all of organized labor. The racketeers are a small percent of organized labor and they must be weeded out.

The Landrum-Griffin bill, for example, outlaws all types of picketing, except where a plant or factory is on strike. Organized picketing has been established and recognized over the years as a peaceful and democratic method. By eliminating or outlawing such picketing we actually empower employers to exploit those working for them, paying them low wages, and forcing them to work longer hours. The only type of picketing I would oppose would be in instances where it is used as blackmail or abused for racketeering purposes.

Thus, the Landrum-Griffin bill affords no protection for the working people, but actually opens up possibilities for their exploitation and the denial of their rights which they have gained over the past half century or more. It will only help to depress the working conditions and the standard of living of the laboring masses of this country. In so doing, we shall not bring about a higher standard of living, but we will lower it for huge segments of our population and this will have a tremendous effect on our whole economy. When labor will not be able to buy the things we produce, when its purchasing power will drop, the whole Nation will feel it.

The Landrum-Griffin bill also bans the so-called "hot cargo" provisions, which is nothing more than a device to maintain nonunion conditions. This is an unfair labor practice for it denies unions the right and the opportunity to protect themselves against ruthless employers.

Finally, the Landrum-Griffin bill is hurting legitimate union organization which is seeking to establish the same pay for the same work for all working people in the country.

I hope and trust that when the conference report on the labor bill is brought back for final consideration by both Houses of Congress, all or most of these objectionable features will have been deleted or so amended as not to hurt legitimate labor unions. We must not turn the clock back. The people of America want to see reform in the ranks of labor, not revenge or the destruction of labor's achievements.

## The Specific Issue at Stake in the Sullivan Amendment—Comment on Washington Post Editorial on Food Stamp Proposal

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post carried an editorial today under the heading "Surpluses for the Hungry" discussing the food stamp amendment which I submitted here last Thursday to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, known as Public Law 480, governing the disposal of surplus food here and overseas. While endorsing generally the idea of getting more of our huge surplus of farm produce to the needy in our own country, the Post raises some questions about my amendment which I am glad to try to answer, and which I think should be answered.

Otherwise, in view of the prestige of the Washington Post and its reputation for fairness, accuracy, and humanitarianism, many of the Members of the Congress who voted for my food stamp amendment last week may begin to wonder whether it was they rather than the editorial writer of the Post who misunderstood what it was we were voting for. COMMITTEE REPORT COVERED ALL CRITICISMS

All of the reservations about the bill made in the editorial, particularly those quoting opponents on the Republican side, were, I thought, fully answered in the debate which preceded passage of the bill, as well as having been answered thoroughly, I thought, in the report of the House Committee on Agriculture on H.R. 1359, the bill which I added to the surplus disposal bill as an amendment. The committee views are stated in House Report No. 907.

Taking the statements in the editorial one by one in order, however, might be a good way to set the record straight. The editorial starts out as follows:

#### SURPLUSES FOR THE HUNGRY

It is easy to see why the House added to the surplus disposal bill the amendment by Congresswoman SULLIVAN authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to set up a food stamp plan for distribution of surplus commodities to needy families in this country. There is a strong sentiment in Congress behind the use of crops that bulge Government warehouses to help friends abroad. Along with this goes a general feeling that surplus food should also be going into empty stomachs in this country. So the House voted by a large majority to let the Secretary of Agriculture distribute such food, preferably through commercial channels, along with stamps that would entitle needy persons to obtain the food, up to the value of a billion dollars a year.

We think the general principle on which the House acted is unquestionably sound. So long as there are hungry people in the United States, surplus food held by the Government ought to be used to relieve them. It would be strange, indeed, to subsidize the shipment of unneeded farm crops

abroad to relieve hunger and deny similar relief to American people. But that is not the specific issue at stake in the Sullivan amendment.

#### FOREIGN DONATIONS OF FOOD FAR EXCEED DOMESTIC

Mr. Speaker, I interrupt the editorial at that point to say that it is exactly that fact which is and was a specific issue at stake in the Sullivan amendment. We have spent over \$5 billion since 1954 in gifts and "sales" of food to nations overseas whereas in the same 5-year period the total of all domestic donations of food—including the school lunch program and food given to State institutions, and so forth, as well as the total value of all food given to needy persons—has come to less than one-tenth of the value of the food given away or "sold" abroad.

I place the words "sales" and "sold" in quotation marks because, as we all know, foreign "sales" under title I of Public Law 480 are sales for foreign currency which is then given or lent back to the country "buying" the food.

To be scrupulously fair about donations as opposed to "sales," the record shows that the Federal Government spent \$1,232,419,000 on outright donations of food to the peoples of other countries under title III of Public Law 480 in the 5-year period, and an additional \$546,130,000 under title II—famine and similar emergency relief—and in the process we spent \$100 million on ocean freight charges alone. This was to help feed the needy of other countries—a very worthwhile cause. But in that same period, of 5 years, we have given away only about \$400 million worth of food to all recipients in this country—and the preponderant share of that went to the school lunch program.

In the 1958 fiscal year, \$272 million worth of food was given to needy persons overseas, and \$75 million was given to needy persons in this country, outside of the school lunch program. They received \$76 million worth of surplus food. State institutions received another \$33 million. Obviously, therefore, we have not done, and are not doing, enough to help our own needy, compared to what we are doing for those of other countries. The record shows it. This, therefore, was very definitely one of the specific issues at stake in the Sullivan amendment and one of the reasons why 232 Members of the House voted for it.

Now, to continue with the Washington Post editorial, Mr. Speaker, it said:

Representative LAIRD pointed out that 20 million school children and needy persons, in this country, are already benefiting from Federal surplus food. The Government packages food and ships it to the States free of charge, leaving the distribution to local agencies. According to Congresswoman MAY, the Sullivan amendment would do nothing more than relieve the States of the expense of distributing these surplus foods.

#### REACHING THE NEEDY ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Mr. Speaker, to say that we do not need any expansion of the surplus food distribution program in this country because 20 million school children and needy persons are receiving some of the food now is to lump more than 14 million school children into the category of



"needy." This figure includes all the children now participating in the Federal school lunch program. Many of them are indeed from needy families. As the Washington Post's own Eve Edstrom pointed out in her series of articles on hungry children in the District of Columbia, a school lunch would be the only hot and nourishing food some children would get. But most school children participating in the school lunch program in the Washington area or in any other area of the country are not hungry children from substandard homes.

Furthermore, out of the 5 million or so needy people now receiving surplus food under the Department of Agriculture program now in effect, the preponderance are not people on public assistance, but are workers temporarily unemployed in the hard-hit distressed areas. They and their families need the help of this surplus food, that I do not dispute. But less than half of those receiving food are the people on public assistance for whom the food stamp plan is most necessary. Furthermore, the 2½ million people on public assistance who now receive surplus food, usually because they live in the distressed areas, make up only about one-third of the total of Americans on various forms of public assistance. As I pointed out in the debate, if you are on public assistance, you can be just as hungry in a city which has low unemployment as in one which has unemployment of a high enough level to justify the expenditure of large amounts of local funds for surplus food distribution.

#### LOCAL DISTRIBUTION COSTLY AND INEFFICIENT

The food stamp plan would not only save these huge and burdensome local costs—so high as to prevent about two-thirds of the Nation's counties from participating—but would also allow for a more orderly method of distributing the food through the stores, rather than on a once-a-month basis at some central depot. And the Federal Government, in utilizing the regular stores in this plan, could save many hundreds of thousands of dollars in packaging and processing and storing the commodities and shutting these surplus foods around the country.

Primarily, however, we would get away from this grim spectacle of poor old people once a month being called to line up at a central depot for a great big package of dried and powdered food items for them to lug home however they can. A food stamp plan operating through the stores would permit them to obtain food items as needed, weekly or oftener, and in fresh rather than powdered form.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post editorial then adds:

One other factor has been emphasized by Secretary Benson. The Commodity Credit Corporation, he says, is not a giant supermarket. More than 85 percent of its surpluses consist of corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco. Since the CCC could distribute only surplus crops, obviously it could not provide a well-rounded diet. It is not clear how much actually would be gained by a food stamp plan to make the products of a few surplus commodities available in commercial stores.

#### NOT JUST STORABLE BASIC COMMODITIES

I interrupt the editorial at this point, Mr. Speaker, to say that here the Washington Post has apparently completely misunderstood the purpose of the food stamp proposal and the suggested mechanics of such a plan. The committee report on H.R. 1359, House Report No. 907, went into this whole question in great detail. I included relevant excerpts from the House committee report as part of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 20, prior to House passage of the bill.

Let me acknowledge that Mr. Benson does not want a food stamp plan, or any other plan for expanding the present food distribution program. He has said he does not want it because it would involve some additional expenditures. But on this point quoted by the Post editorial, he cannot be speaking of the food stamp plan contained in H.R. 1359 and agreed to by the House last week as part of Public Law 480. For under my amendment, not only storable items in surplus but all agricultural commodities, including the perishables, in periodic surplus and eligible for removal by use of section 32 funds, could be included in the food distribution. Right now, this could include, in addition to the cornmeal, flour, rice, and powdered milk now being given out, and the butter and cheese previously donated, such items as poultry, fresh—rather than powdered—eggs, pork products, fresh—rather than powdered—milk, other dairy products, and any fresh vegetables in such temporary surplus as to depress the market. In other words, all of the items the Secretary can now legally donate to the school lunch program under section 32 or sell for foreign currencies under Public Law 480 could also be included in the food stamp plan.

He has limited his use of section 32 funds almost entirely to foods which can be used in the school lunch program. The farmer complains about this, pointing out that section 32 has much broader powers than that Members of Congress from areas now participating in the surplus food distribution program also complain, pointing out that section 32 funds can be and should be used to provide a greater variety of surplus foods for the needy. Under the food stamp plan, the market for these additional items of surplus foods would be ready made. The need is certainly there from the standpoint of both the farmer and the needy.

Mr. Speaker, the Post editorial states in conclusion:

Probably the flow of these commodities into consumption by needy families ought to be stepped up. But there are substantial advantages in letting the States choose their own means of distributing help to their needy citizens. From the national point of view the important thing is making the food available—not a particular method of distribution.

In reply to that, Mr. Speaker, I might say that nearly all of the Senators who recently testified before the Senate Agriculture Committee on the surplus food disposal program in their areas made the point that adequate help is not getting to the people who need it most because

of the deficiencies of the present distribution program. And they nearly all urged a food stamp plan be adopted.

#### WASHINGTON POST DEMONSTRATED GENUINE CONCERN

The Washington Post has been an active and effective proponent of feeding our hungry in this country out of the great abundance of our harvests, and I want to make clear that in making these comments on the editorial which appeared today I am in no sense implying any lack of sympathy by the Post for the people who would benefit from a food stamp plan. The newspaper has proved its humanitarianism in many, many ways.

But I know the Post likes to present its case accurately, and in this instance I think it made a mistake in taking as its text for the editorial the casual and inaccurate statements of a Secretary of Agriculture who sees in this surplus food only a big storage and budgetary headache, not the blessing it could be in meeting poverty and want in our midst. His objections to the food stamp plan were fully reported to the House Agriculture Committee. All of these issues were brought up in the hearings.

The report of the House committee fully explains why the Secretary's objections were rejected. I recommend to anyone interested in knowing both the good and bad things about the present distribution program and the good and bad of the proposed food stamp plan that he read the report of the House Agriculture Committee on H.R. 1359, House Report No. 907.

There is one big fault with the food stamp bill as reported by the committee and as included as an amendment to Public Law 480. It is that it merely provides discretionary authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to initiate such a program. As I introduced the bill, it would have directed and required him to institute it.

#### Kennedy and Anfuso Honored by Morgenstern Foundation

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

#### HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY and I were honored today by the Morris Morgenstern Foundation of New York which presented to us, at a special ceremony in Senator KENNEDY's office, parchment replicas of the famous letter written by George Washington in 1790 to the Touro Synagogue in Newport, R.I. These awards were presented to us by Mr. Morris Morgenstern, the founder of the foundation bearing his name, for "their inspirational efforts in combatting bigotry."

Senator KENNEDY and I were privileged to be the first to receive this award, which will be presented annually by the foundation to national figures for their

efforts in combating bigotry and persecution. The award has as its text President Washington's statement in his letter of 1790 in which he assured the Jewish congregation of Newport that the United States will give "to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance."

In the summer of the year 1790, after the troubled years of the American Revolution, the first President of the United States made a tour of the country. He came to the little seafaring town of Newport, R.I., in the part of the country colonized by the great champion of religious liberty, Roger Williams. The people of Newport turned out to greet President Washington.

Moses Seixas, sexton of the Hebrew congregation of Newport, who was a friend of Washington's, sent him a warm letter of welcome. Washington's reply to this letter of welcome, addressed to the Hebrew congregation of Newport, is today one of the Nation's most cherished historical documents. It is an eloquent expression of American freedom and religious harmony. In 1946 the Touro Synagogue in Newport, which is now about 200 years old, was dedicated as a national shrine.

The words "to bigotry no sanction" have played a vital role in the life of Morris Morgenstern, well-known millionaire financier, philanthropist, and realtor, who resides in Long Beach, N.Y.

Owner of the original letter by George Washington, in which this quote appears, Mr. Morgenstern is a firm believer that George Washington was the personification of the American ideal of freedom. As long as he can remember, he has been a crusader of the principles of tolerance expounded by our first President.

Through his efforts, the Washington letter has been seen by millions as part of the Freedom Train Exhibition and at universities in various parts of the country. It is now on display at the B'nai B'rith Building in Washington, D.C.

The 78-year-old president of Morris Morgenstern & Son is more anxious today to spread the word of George Washington than ever before.

Morris Morgenstern, as an individual, has probably financed more building than anyone else in the United States. But he is not happy being just a successful businessman. For years he has found time to help good causes and actively support various organizations, regardless of race or religion.

In 1949 he created the Morris Morgenstern Foundation, "to aid men and women of every creed, race, and ancestry to contribute their highest gifts to the development of our national culture."

Through his efforts, the Levittown Jewish Center was enabled to expand from its original facilities accommodating a handful of children to a synagogue of prime status in Long Island.

He was also drafted by the directors of the West Side Branch of the YMCA to be chairman of a committee to raise funds to provide decent recreational facilities for the boys living in Hell's Kitchen.

Judge Albert Conway brought to Mr. Morgenstern's attention the fact that

although children of other faiths were provided with houses of worship at the Ten Mile River Boys Scout Camp, the Jewish boys were not so provided. Mr. Morgenstern made the necessary funds available for construction of what is now known as the Synagogue in the Pines.

The list of agencies which he helps is endless. They include the Brooklyn Hebrew Home and Hospital for the Aged; the Infants Home of Brooklyn; the Cathedral Club; Yeshiva University; Cardinal Spellman's Foundling Home, among others.

Born in Russia, Morris was brought to the United States at the age of 4. Because his family was poor, he had to give up school and start working. At 14, he borrowed some money and went into the business of manufacturing seltzer bottles. Eventually he began dabbling in real estate and founded the finance firm he now heads.

Mr. Morgenstern — known affectionately as "M.M." by his friends — has been the personal guest of Vice President Nixon. Dr. Jonas Salk, the conqueror of polio, recently hailed Mr. Morgenstern for his humanitarian work. He has received citations from Presidents Roosevelt, Truman and most recently Eisenhower, for his invaluable efforts in behalf of the sick, poor, and needy of all races and creeds.

The text of the George Washington letter follows:

*To the Hebrew Congregation in Newport, R.I.*

GENTLEMEN: While I receive, with much satisfaction, your address replete with expressions of affection and esteem, I rejoice in the opportunity of assuring you, that I shall always retain a grateful remembrance of the cordial welcome I experienced in my visit to Newport, from all classes of citizens.

The reflection on the days of difficulty and danger which are past is rendered the more sweet, from a consciousness that they are succeeded by days of uncommon prosperity and security. If we have wisdom to make the best use of the advantages with which we are now favored, we cannot fail, under the just administration of a good Government, to become a great and a happy people.

The citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy, a policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that toleration is spoken of, as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoyed the exercise, of their inherent natural rights. For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support.

It would be inconsistent with the frankness of my character not to avow that I am pleased with your favorable opinion of my administration, and fervent wishes for my felicity. May the children of the stock of Abraham, who dwell in this land, continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other inhabitants, while every one shall sit in safety under his own vine and figtree, and there shall be none to make him afraid. May the father of all mercies scatter light and not darkness in our paths, and make us all in our several vocations useful here, and in his own due time and way everlastingly happy.

G. WASHINGTON.

## Distinguished Service to Agriculture Award to Senator Frank Carlson

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, at the 45th annual meeting of the Missouri Farmers Association at Columbia, Mo., on August 24, the Honorable FRANK CARLSON, Senator from Kansas, received the award for distinguished service to agriculture. Following is the citation used by the president, Fred V. Heinkel, in presenting the award:

Because of your genuine interest and leadership in the encouragement of farmer owned and controlled cooperative associations and your sincere and demonstrated friendship for farmers; and because of your particular and thorough understanding of the difficult problems involved in the production and marketing of our great wheat crop, and your dedication to finding a solution to these problems, a solution which is of vital importance to the farmers of Missouri, Kansas, and the rest of the Midwest's great Wheat Belt, we feel that you have fully earned and deserve the highest honor and award the Missouri Farmers Association has to offer.

Therefore, the board of directors of the Missouri Farmers Association has voted unanimously to bestow upon you the MFA's award for distinguished service to agriculture.

FRED V. HEINKEL,  
President.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the Missouri Farmers Association honored our distinguished colleague from our adjoining sister State. Hereafter follows the speech of the Honorable FRANK CARLSON delivered on this auspicious occasion:

SPEECH BY SENATOR FRANK CARLSON, ANNUAL MEETING, MISSOURI FARMERS ASSOCIATION, INC., COLUMBIA, MO., AUGUST 24, 1959

It is an honor and a privilege for me to appear on your program today. We folks in Kansas have always had a great respect for the farmer in Missouri and especially for your active, hard hitting Missouri Farmers Association.

After accepting your kind invitation to speak here today, I spent some time thinking about a wide range of topics which I would have liked to discuss with you. As you probably know, a Senator becomes involved in so many activities today that he has difficulty in keeping up to date in any one field. After considering several alternatives, I decided to try to organize my thoughts and observations regarding the current impasse which has developed in the farm policy field.

I ask, What, if any, progress has been made in national farm policy in the past 30 years?

I ask, Why do we find it so difficult to reach a common agreement on desirable revisions in farm price support legislation?

And finally, I ask, How and in what manner can we expect to make progress in improving farmers' bargaining power in months and years immediately ahead?

These are the questions that interest me, and I believe they are questions in which you are interested.

When I consider the first question, "What, if any, progress has been made in national farm policy?" it occurred to me that it was just 30 years ago that we first made the



stabilization of farm prices a national policy objective. The Agricultural Marketing Act, the first national legislation having as its objective the stabilization of farm prices, was passed in 1929 with the active support of President Hoover.

Those of you who have as many gray hairs as I do will remember that the Agricultural Marketing Act created a Federal Farm Board with a price stabilization fund of \$500 million and a charter to assist in the development of regional and national marketing cooperatives. The Board hoped that, with the help of credit from the \$500 million stabilization fund, these cooperatives would be able to stabilize market supplies and prices.

President Hoover, especially anxious that this new Board should succeed, prevailed upon Alexander Legge, the former president of the International Harvester Co., to become its first chairman. Soon after taking office Mr. Legge explained the purpose of the Board in a U.S. Chamber of Commerce meeting in these words:

"Nearly 10 years of discussion, controversy, and compromise led Congress, in its wisdom, to declare that permanent solution of the agricultural problem lies in collective action on the part of the farmers. It created the Farm Board to help producers organize for such action, both as to production and marketing of their crops, the purpose being to enable them to put their industry on economic parity with other industries."

Apparently the chamber of commerce opposed farm price stabilization 30 years ago, just as it does today, for later in the same speech Mr. Legge said:

"Is there any reason why those who have prospered and grown apace through governmental aid and assistance to various industries should object to the farmer getting his?"

"You fellows, better organized, got yours while the farmer, unorganized, failed to get anything."

"The farmers have little or nothing to say about what their product brings. Costs of production can be passed along to the buyer by nearly everyone but the farmer. Unorganized, he has to take for his product what the other fellow is willing to give him."

No one knows how successful these first efforts at farm price stabilization would have been under normal peacetime conditions. We know, of course, that they were unable to stem the tide of economic recession which set in in the fall of 1929.

We usually think of the Federal Farm Board as having failed in its price stabilization efforts. But it was this first Farm Board experience which convinced Mr. Legge and other farm leaders that production and marketing controls were essential for the success of farm price stabilization policies.

Mr. Legge, with his background of manufacturing experience, was a vigorous advocate of balancing supplies with available markets. After several years of service, in his letter of resignation to President Hoover, he included this significant sentence:

"While there are still a few of the agricultural leaders who lower their voices when they speak of production control, yet practically all of them have accepted the principle as essential."

The production control programs of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration in the 1930's were a direct outgrowth of the Farm Board's experience. The Secretary of Agriculture in 1933 also inaugurated price-support loans direct to producers. In the fall of 1933 producers of cotton and corn who had kept production in line with their allotments were offered loans on their crops at above-market values. This was the beginning of direct price-support programs as we know them today.

The price-support features of the farm program increased in popularity throughout the 1930's. It became increasingly difficult, however, to hold production in line with the volume that could be marketed at the support price levels with continued large unemployment rolls. Just as a matter of interest I looked up the records and found that the loans and inventories of the Commodity Credit Corporation increased from \$279 million in 1938 to \$1.7 billion at the end of 1942.

I often wonder how our farm price policy would have met this problem of growing stocks in the prewar years if high levels of employment could have been achieved and World War II could have been avoided.

World War II generated economic forces, just the opposite of those prevailing in the 1930's, and gave us an opportunity to try out Government price supports as economic incentives for increased production. The experience of the war period was not particularly revealing, however, for market prices remained well above support price levels most of the time.

Production goals replaced quotas and, to increase production, farmers were given all possible incentives feasible in view of wartime conditions. They responded with such vigor that per capita food consumption (in part associated with fuller employment) increased 6 percent. In addition, large quantities of food were supplied to the Armed Forces and to our allies.

Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, recently said: "In fact, the increase in agricultural production in America was largely responsible for winning the war, and was a feat which was exceeded only by the men in the fighting forces themselves."

"After the war the productive power of American farms was instrumental in putting countries of Western Europe and other parts of the world back on their feet."

"This had hardly been accomplished when the Korean war broke out; and there was increased demand for certain commodities, particularly wheat."

"Again the American farmer responded." The 6 years following the Korean war have given us a different kind of experience. It has been a frustrating experience for farm leaders, farm program administrators, and farm-minded legislators.

During the last 6 years net farm income has been almost \$20 billion less than in the previous 6 years.

Farm prices are now 17 percent lower than 6 years ago and the trend is still downward in spite of the general business boom in progress.

Farm production in 1958 was 15 percent higher than the new record levels achieved in 1952-53, and total production in 1959 may equal or exceed 1958.

We have bartered, sold for local currencies, and given away at home and abroad \$8 billion of farm products.

Government loans and inventories of farm products have increased to almost \$9 billion and further increases are expected under present legislation as currently administered.

Net budget expenditures of the Department of Agriculture in the past 6 years have reached \$28 billion.

Prof. Dale Hathaway of Michigan State University, who spent 1956 on the staff of the Council of Economic Advisers, made a widely accepted appraisal of recent U.S. farm policy in the May issue of the Journal of Farm Economics. The key points in this appraisal are as follows:

1. The program probably has maintained farm income (both in the aggregate and per capita) at levels higher than would have existed in the absence of a program. (Other reputable economists estimate that net farm income would have been one-fourth or more lower without supports in recent years.)

2. The program that has operated has not seriously impeded agricultural adjustment, especially the adjustment of the agricultural labor force.

3. Aggregate agricultural efficiency probably has not been impaired by the program.

5. Despite the conclusion that our recent program has not been a major contribution to the present difficulties in agriculture, neither has it contributed positively to a solution of the problem.

It (the program) has failed, despite massive expenditures, to bring a solution to the U.S. farm problem.

To Professor Hathaway's appraisal I should like to add the following too often overlooked facts:

Over the past 30 years, with farm price supports in operation most of the time, the cost of food in terms of workers' earnings has dropped sharply. A weekly market basket of food for a family of three which cost 25 percent of the worker's average weekly earnings in 1958 would have cost 48 percent of a worker's weekly earnings 30 years earlier.

Food costs less in the United States in terms of workers' wages than anywhere else in the world. Although Government costs of farm price support programs are higher than they should be, they equal only 5 percent of the money spent for food at retail. If the pro rata share of farm program costs had been added to the cost of food, workers in 1958 would have spent only 26 percent of their weekly earnings for a market basket of food as compared with 35 percent for the same food 10 years earlier, and 41 percent 20 years earlier.

Throughout the last two decades, output per hour of farm labor has increased at a rate equal to two to three times that of the nonfarm worker. Largely because of this rapid increase in efficiency, people have left the farms in record numbers in the past 20 years. Yet workers in agriculture, mostly independent farm operators, receive less than half as much for their labor as non-farm workers. The economic benefits of this increase in efficiency have largely been passed on to the processors and consumers.

When I reflected on the second question, "Why do we find it so difficult to reach a common agreement on desirable revisions in farm price support legislation?" I found it especially challenging. Actually, in the past 6 years I have given a good deal of thought to this question. And I have changed my views somewhat over the period.

In the past several months it has seemed to me that the single most important factor has been the wide difference in views as to the economic facts relating to agriculture. I am told that for the country as a whole, perhaps a third of the farmers believe farm income will drop sharply if effective supply management programs are not adopted soon; an equal number of farmers just as sincerely believe that farm income will be maintained at present levels or will be increased by lower price supports and the removal of production restrictions; and the other third of the farmers are undecided as between these two points of view.

The proportion of farmers holding each of these views differs in the different farming areas. A large majority of the tobacco, cotton, and wheat producers apparently believe in the need for production controls while only a minority of the corn and livestock producers appear ready to accept production controls or believe them to be feasible for their products. There also is a wide diversity of views with respect to the effectiveness of acreage controls and of market prices as incentives in adjusting supplies to available markets.

In my opinion if we could more nearly agree on the relevant economic facts we

could rather quickly agree on desirable changes in farm price support legislation. All of us would prefer more, rather than less, individual freedom in our farming operations. All of us would prefer to do away with price support programs and production controls if farm prices and farm income would not fall to disastrously low levels.

I am not an economist and it is not my purpose to attempt a review of all the important facts relating to farm price support programs. There are, however, three misconceptions which I would like to clear up. First, the evidence does not support the often made assertions that control programs have been ineffective and that farm price support programs have stimulated greater production.

Official statistics compiled by the Department of Agriculture show that in the last 5 years production of the basic crops has been held 21 percent lower than the non-basics, using 1952-53 (the last 2 years before acreage controls and marketing quotas were invoked) as the base period. The production of the basic crops, feed grains other than corn and soybeans (crops increased most by diversions from the allotment crops) in the last 5 years has averaged 2 percent lower in relation to the 1952-53 base than all other (non-price-supported) crops. Obviously production controls have not been as effective as they should have been but they have held production in check, as compared with that of the non-price-supported crops.

Second, the economic facts do not support the propaganda to the effect that the producers of the non-price-supported products, especially livestock, have demonstrated the superiority of free market policies in recent years. In the 6 years 1953-58, on a net basis 94.5 million tons of feed grains and wheat were removed from commercial market channels by surplus disposal and Government storage programs.

Had these additional feed grains and wheat remained in commercial market channels, their outlet would have been livestock feeding. Livestock feed grains supplies would have been 14 percent larger for the entire 6-year period. In the absence of price-support programs on feed grains and wheat, total livestock feeding would have been about 14 percent larger, thus increasing supplies and lowering prices of livestock products generally.

Hogs which would have utilized about half of the increased feed supplies would have been sent to market in about 16 percent larger numbers. An increase in marketings of this magnitude, on the basis of recent Department of Agriculture analyses, would have lowered hog prices one-third or more below what they actually were.

While we are discussing farm surpluses and the effect they have had on farm prices generally, I want to discuss briefly our crop surplus problem in Kansas. Wheat is the basic crop and the farmers are very much concerned and embittered about the continuous reminder to the public about the cost to the taxpayers for the storage of wheat and cost of the program. Wheat is the political football—the whipping boy for those who do not know the farm problem.

Admittedly, we have a surplus of some 120,917,000 bushels of wheat stocks in all storage positions as of August 7. On August 7 corn stocks in the United States were 1,033,431,000 bushels and this figure will go up about 340 million bushels in the next 2 or 3 weeks, or to a total of 1,373 million bushels.

With the present anticipated corn yield this year, corn could also be a great burden in our farm surplus problem.

Stocks of oats on August 7 were 36,495,000 bushels—grain sorghums 269,912,000 bushels.

I mention these figures because the wheat farmers of this Nation have been receiving the brunt of criticism for surplus crops that are not limited just to wheat.

The third misconception relates to the potentialities of market expansion as a solution for the current imbalance between supplies and market outlets.

The evidence does not support the optimism often expressed regarding the widening of markets which will occur with lower prices. Although I have always supported programs for market expansion I believe we should be realistic in our expectations.

In spite of the greatly increased promotional efforts in recent years, 9 percent more American consumers, with 10 percent higher real incomes in 1957, bought 11 percent more food, including more higher cost meats and fewer cereals and potatoes than in 1952. Yet farmers received \$600 million less for this food in 1957 than for the smaller quantity taken 5 years earlier.

Prof. Murray Benedict of the University of California, a long-time student of national farm policies, says: " \* \* \* so far as food is concerned, once a nation is as well fed as ours now is, demand can grow only about as fast as population grows."

Official reports show that in the 4½ years of surplus disposal operations ending December 31, 1958, we removed a total of \$10.7 billion of farm products from commercial markets by disposal and net storage programs. These disposal and storage programs provided an outlet for \$2.4 billion of farm products a year. Had these extra products moved through commercial markets, they would have caused a sharp decline in prices. The most recent studies available indicate annual farm income would have dropped by at least twice this amount.

In my opinion far too small a part of our expanded research programs in recent years has been devoted to an objective study of farm price-support program results.

There has been far too much propaganda based on misconceptions of agriculture's basic economic problems. There has been far too little comprehension of the economic significance of the output—increasing effects of rapid technological change in food production at a time when the peoples of the industrialized Western World already are well fed. There has been far too little understanding of the economic effects on farmers of the market pricing policies of big business and big labor.

I believe that if we could get widespread common understanding of the economic facts and relationships in these fields it would not be difficult to reach agreement on desirable revisions in price support legislation.

This brings us to a consideration of the third question, "How and in what manner can we expect to make progress in the near future in improving farmers' bargaining power?" I hope you won't be disappointed if I fumble this one a little.

Although I am vitally interested in farm problems I am not a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Consequently, I have not become involved in the cross currents of conflicting recommendations which almost overwhelm the members of the Committee on Agriculture.

As I see it, however, producers of the basic crops—with the exception of corn—have a tolerable satisfactory history of price stabilization and supply management through marketing quotas. Producers of the more important perishable crops appear to have learned how to use marketing agreements and marketing orders effectively in stabilizing their market supplies and prices.

Dairymen have been able to stabilize their prices with the help of Federal milk-marketing orders, where the milk goes into fluid use and price-supporting Government purchases as necessary for manufactured dairy products.

While it is difficult to discover any clear trends in recent farm-policy developments, it appears to me that these groups are likely to maintain and improve on such price-stabilization measures as they now have. As technological progress continues to expand the productive capacity of the agricultural plant faster than markets expand, the producers of these other products may be more or less successful in balancing their supplies with market outlets available at stable prices and in diverting their unused resources into feed grain and livestock production.

For the farm economy as a whole we are now producing 6 to 9 percent more products than can be sold in commercial markets at stable prices. Most of this excess capacity is likely to be diverted into feed and livestock production. Since feed grains and livestock products now make up two-thirds of total farm marketings, an expansion of some 8 to 12 percent in feed grains and livestock would be necessary to absorb current excess productive capacity in agriculture.

In addition, stocks of both feed grains and wheat are excessive. Even though exports are expanded as much as possible through continued Public Law 480 programs, it is probable that a part of these excess stocks can only be liquidated by feeding them domestically to livestock.

Every effort must be made to expand our export of farm commodities. The export of these farm commodities means not only dollars for farmers, but it has been, and will continue to be, an important part of a program of bringing closer relationships with countries that do not have an abundant food supply. Food for peace must be more than just a slogan; it can and must be a reality.

Recently the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, of which I am a member, reported to the Senate a bill, S. 1771, which is known as the International Food for Peace Act of 1959. I am a cosponsor of that bill.

From a humanitarian standpoint, I know of nothing we can do as a Nation that will win friends faster and more permanently than getting food and fiber into the hands of the needy.

The distribution of this food to underdeveloped countries where there are millions of needy and undernourished people is more than a commodity-disposal operation; it has important psychological value. In my opinion, it is one of the most effective forms of foreign aid.

Although attention was centered on wheat in this session of Congress, CCC loans and inventories of feed grains already are 10 percent larger than the loans and inventories of wheat. It seems almost certain that by this time next year CCC investments in feed grains relative to wheat will be even larger than at present. Hog prices will be distressingly low, poultry and egg prices will be less than fully satisfactory, and cattle prices will be starting their cyclical decline as marketings increase.

If there is anything to the old saying that necessity is the mother of invention, I am inclined to believe that in the next year or two increasing Government stocks of feed grains and declining livestock prices will force Midwest farmers to agree upon some program for improving their bargaining power.

Undoubtedly, it will have to include placing a part of our cropland in a conservation reserve. The central issue that should receive a great deal more study and discussion is whether or not more direct market supply management programs will be needed to make a conservation reserve program reasonably effective for feed grains and livestock products.

This has been a rather long statement, but the agricultural problem today is a complex and badly misunderstood problem. We and



the public have been confused by the substitution of cheerful and hopeful statements for vital economic facts.

It is my hope that the leaders of our farm organizations, the farmers themselves, and our citizens generally will take a realistic view, with the hope that we may work out a solution which will maintain price stabilization and give the American farmer his fair share of our national income.

## Home Rule for the District of Columbia

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 28, 1959, I testified before the House District Committee in support of my bill, H.R. 4630. My testimony was as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK, JULY 28, 1959

Mr. MULTER. For the record, I am ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Representative from the 13th District of New York.

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear here this morning in support of home rule for the District of Columbia.

At the outset may I say that I understand and respect the views of other Members of Congress who oppose home rule for the District. At the same time I very vigorously and sincerely disagree with them.

It is my opinion that not only should the hearings go forward expeditiously, but that a bill should then be reported to the House so that the House may work its will as to whether or not the District should have home rule and if so the form that that home rule should take.

Mr. McMILLAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question at that point?

Mr. MULTER. Surely.

Mr. McMILLAN. I take it you do not favor the discharge rule before the Rules Committee that would not permit the House to work its will?

Mr. MULTER. I do not know as of this moment of a discharge petition, if that is what you are referring to.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am referring to the discharge rule that provides for a 1-hour debate on the home rule bills.

Mr. MULTER. I do not think a discharge petition has been filed yet but, most respectfully, I hope it will be filed and I hope to be one of the first to sign the petition, and I hope in short order the petition will be signed and the legislation will be brought before the House.

Mr. McMILLAN. Perhaps I misunderstood you. I understood you to say you wanted the House to work its will, and the House cannot work its will on this legislation in the period of 1 hour.

Mr. MULTER. I understand your statement, but I do not agree with it and cannot subscribe to it.

[Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Officer, if anyone attempts any applause or any other demonstration in the room, I want you to see who it is and promptly remove him.

The OFFICER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. Proceed, please, Mr. MULTER.

Mr. MULTER. Addressing myself further for the moment to Chairman McMILLAN's remarks, it is my firm opinion that the House

can work its will on any bill that is brought before it, whether it comes before it through the committee procedure of being reported by a committee and then by a rule, or without either report from the committee or a rule. And when a discharge petition is filed and it is signed by the necessary number constituting a majority of the House, that is the will of the House that the House shall determine whether they shall pass on the legislation. That is the first question the discharge petition puts before the House. The House can then decide it will not consider the matter, or, on the other hand, if the majority says it will consider the matter, the House proceeds to determine what it will do with the bill and perfect the bill if that is the will of the majority. It is my considered opinion that it is and that the majority will so express itself in favor of home rule for the District and will bring forth a bill that will give to the District a modicum of home rule, probably not as much as I would like to see, and probably not as much as other Members would like to see, but, at the expense of referring to the cliché that maybe this is just a foot in the door, I for one am willing that we get that foot in the door or that toe in the door and move forward from that. If we get some kind of home rule for the District this year, after we have had some experience under it I hope we can perfect it and give to the District more and more home rule.

I have before me the letter from our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. McMILLAN, dated July 27, which was addressed to me and I believe to all the authors of other home rule bills, in which he states that among other things he will request the chairman of the subcommittee to insist on all authors of bills making an oral statement so that we will be able to get all the information possible on this subject.

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct. That letter was sent to the author of every bill because this is an important question and I think every member who thinks enough of this question to introduce a bill should come in and explain how he can get by the Constitution. You are a good lawyer, and we want you to tell us how you can get by article I, section 8, of the Constitution.

Mr. MULTER. I will get to that in a moment, sir.

I would first like to say that this is rather an unusual request. The chairman himself, Mr. McMILLAN, has been the first to violate it by having the chairman of the subcommittee read his own statement, and I respectfully suggest that other members who desire to file a written statement be permitted to do so and to file it just as though he had made it orally.

Mr. McMILLAN. Of course, everybody may submit a statement, we will be glad to have it, but we feel any man who introduces a bill should be willing to come in and explain it. I did not introduce a bill.

Mr. MULTER. I understand. I do trust the committee will take the view that when 26 Members of the House introduce an identical bill, if one or more come in here and explain the bill and they explain in writing or otherwise that they support that bill, that would be a sufficient record.

I do not pretend to know all about home rule or all about all the bills that have been submitted, but I think it is high time, after the other body has five times in the last 10 years passed a bill for home rule for the District, it is high time this committee report a bill to the House so that the House can decide by vote if it wants home rule for the District and to what extent.

Mr. McMILLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. McMILLAN.

Mr. McMILLAN. I do not know whether you were here when we had the bill before the

House and the House spent 2 whole days on home rule?

Mr. MULTER. I recall it, sir.

Mr. McMILLAN. And the bill was not passed.

Mr. MULTER. I recall it, sir.

Mr. McMILLAN. According to the radio and television and the newspapers it would appear we have never had one before the House.

Mr. MULTER. It has been 10 years since we had one, and I think it is time the House decide whether the people of the District are entitled to the right of representation as well as the burden of taxation. One goes with the other, and without both we do not have the democratic form of government—with a small "d"—that we brag about to the free world and that we like to talk about during campaign time, and that goes whether we believe in States' rights or a central government. That is unimportant. Certainly all should agree that everybody has a right to vote and elect their representatives and their representatives should have a right to participate by voting on every piece of legislation passed or considered which affects their lives and their property and their rights.

I have introduced two bills. One bill, H.R. 4630, is the bill which is preferred by the administration. While I have disagreed vigorously from time to time with the administration on many problems—and probably will again many times before this administration leaves office—this is one time I am willing to go along with them again with the idea in mind that this is half a loaf and this half loaf is better than no loaf.

I will not take the time to discuss each of the sections in that bill. I did place a detailed analysis of the bill in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the course of a special order I had on February 17. It appears at page 2312 of the RECORD and subsequent pages up to and including page 2317.

The other bill which I introduced, H.R. 8081, is the so-called Morse bill, and it is quite like the one which the Senate has now passed and sent to this body. I will not take the time to analyze that bill either.

The first bill calls for elected local legislators and an appointed Governor.

The second bill calls for an elected mayor and city council and so forth.

Both bills present the primary issue—

Mr. DAVIS. Will you designate them by number?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir. The first bill is H.R. 4630 and the second bill is H.R. 8081.

Both bills present the first and primary issue the Congress must determine, and that is, Shall there be home rule?

Mr. DAVIS. I shall have to ask you to suspend until we can have the noise stopped outside.

(Brief suspension of the hearing.)

Mr. DAVIS. Some of the people who attended the hearing this morning seem to be determined to make this the same kind of situation which prevailed in Havana last week. If we just had the beards and machetes we would have a pretty good duplication of it out in the hall this morning and we apparently would be ready to begin the distribution of land and other property.

We will proceed in an orderly way, and I think you can proceed now, Mr. MULTER.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I think before we go much further I ought to direct the attention of the committee to one of the primary rights of citizens of our country. It starts with the Declaration of Independence and it is written into our Constitution with such bold letters and big type that none can misunderstand it, and none should ever forget it, and that is the inherent right of citizens of our country to assemble publicly and to peaceably petition their legislators and their Congress, and that is what these people are trying to do who are

in this room and out in the hall, and if there is any disorder the committee must bear the responsibility for it by not providing adequate room for these people to come in and quietly attend the hearing and hear what is being said.

Mr. DAVIS. Will you yield at that point?

Mr. MULTER. As soon as I finish this point. I submit this hearing should be adjourned to a larger room, if one is available, which I am sure it is, so that we can all, citizens outside, and citizens inside, listen quietly and orderly and give them the orderly hearing I am sure they all want.

I yield, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. MULTER, as I stated in answer to a question by our colleague, Mr. WIER, a moment ago, we have been able to hear all the legislation that we have had hearings on in this room. We are able to hold these hearings here now and will hold them here in an orderly fashion and will hear everyone who desires to be heard on this legislation.

This is a staged demonstration, as you well know and as all of us well know, and its purpose is not to present any facts to the committee but to bring pressure on it. I do not think it will succeed.

We will be glad to hear you and we will be glad to hear every other interested person.

You may proceed.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman and my distinguished colleagues on the committee, although I did not participate in the preparation for this demonstration or in the march on the Hill, I approve of it and I remind you gentlemen that the Boston Tea Party also was a staged demonstration, a demonstration against the King and his tyrannical use of his powers. It did not have its effect. It resulted in a war, a revolution, and the birth of this country.

I am sure that no such demonstration will ever again result in war in this country to attain for the people the privileges and rights that are guaranteed to them by the Constitution, and I am sure the Congress will eventually give them all the rights they are guaranteed by our Constitution, including the right to elect a voting Representative to the House of Representatives and to elect their own local officials.

With respect to the specific question that was tendered by Mr. McMILLAN of whether or not home rule legislation would be constitutional, may I suggest that in the same article I, section 8, the Congress is given the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof, yet no one denies that the National Bank Act and the Federal Reserve Act are constitutional. They have been tested and found constitutional and I have not heard anybody in recent days argue against the constitutionality of the National Bank Act and the Federal Reserve Act. Both acts take from the Congress, by the Congress's own legislation, and give to the Comptroller of the Currency and to national banks and to Federal Reserve banks the right to do that which is reserved to the Congress in this same article, this same section, with reference to money.

How much more important is it that we give personal rights—the right to vote, the right of representation—to these people by legislative enactment. We do it every time we create a State. I know the answer will be, "But look at the particular language of section 8, clause 17." I do look at it, but I do not overlook when I get to the same article, same section, clause 18, the same Constitution says, "The Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

I think that is the complete answer to any argument that may be urged that home rule legislation would be unconstitutional.

Mr. McMILLAN. While you are on that subject, were you in Congress when we had the last hearings on this subject?

Mr. MULTER. I came here in 1947, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McMILLAN. You were not a member of this committee at that time?

Mr. MULTER. No, sir; I was not.

Mr. McMILLAN. We had a statement from the late John W. Davis, who I am sure you will agree was one of the greatest constitutional lawyers in the United States.

Mr. MULTER. One of the greatest.

Mr. McMILLAN. He sent down a statement to the committee stating we did not have the right as Members of Congress to delegate our authority in this respect.

Mr. MULTER. I respect the opinion of the late John W. Davis as a great constitutional lawyer. I disagreed with him in this instance, as I have in other instances. Without going into the details, I recall distinctly one case that went to the Supreme Court in which we were on opposite sides. The Supreme Court unanimously agreed with me. And I hope if the home rule bill goes before the Supreme Court it will again agree with me. I think the arguments for constitutionality of the home rule bill are of much greater weight and have more validity than the respected and respectable opinion of the late John W. Davis.

Mr. BROYHILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. BROYHILL. We appreciate your stating your views. However, it seems our Founding Fathers went to great lengths to make sure Congress would exercise authority over the District of Columbia, because they added some words to emphasize that language that would otherwise be superfluous. They said Congress shall have power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever. The language without the words "exclusive" and "whatsoever" would still make sense, but they added the words "exclusive" legislation in all cases "whatsoever." It seems to me their intent was to exercise the authority of Congress over the city.

There is and has been for several years a resolution pending before the House Committee on the Judiciary to grant to the citizens of the District of Columbia who are American citizens the right to vote for President and Vice President.

To my knowledge no consideration has been given by the Judiciary Committee to that legislation. I have not heard of any Member of Congress who objected to that proposal to give the citizens of the District of Columbia the right to vote for President and Vice President, but there does not seem to be the same desire to give them that right—which seems to me to be more important than to give them the limited authority involved here. And it will be limited because whatever bill is passed there will be the question of how much voice the local people would have, but in voting for President and Vice President there would be no question about it, and I am certain the House would pass an amendment to give these citizens of the District of Columbia the right to vote for President and Vice President, and it would go through.

I am wondering why the people interested in this legislation do not start a discharge petition to discharge the Judiciary Committee and bring that bill before the House?

What do you say about that?

Mr. MULTER. I say let us not pass the buck.

Mr. BROYHILL. I am not passing the buck.

Mr. MULTER. I am willing to join with you tomorrow in filing a petition to discharge the Judiciary Committee from further consideration of the bill to pass a constitutional amendment to give the citizens of the Dis-

trict of Columbia a right to vote for President and Vice President.

Mr. BROYHILL. Do you not think that is a more important bill?

Mr. MULTER. I think it is a very important bill and I am willing to join in filing a petition to discharge the Judiciary Committee, but I think we should leave no stone unturned to give them both bills.

Mr. BROYHILL. You would eliminate the constitutional question by a constitutional amendment to give them that right.

Mr. MULTER. I do not think you need a constitutional amendment. I agree the weight of authority is with you in saying there is need for a constitutional amendment, but I would risk passing a law and giving the right to them and I would risk what would happen in the U.S. Supreme Court as to whether that bill is constitutional or not.

Mr. BROYHILL. I will not argue with you on that.

Mr. MULTER. I say let us do the two things. Let us do the three things. Let us pass the constitutional amendment, too. By the time the constitutional amendment is adopted I think the Supreme Court would have passed on the constitutionality of the legislation. I am willing to vote for the constitutional amendment because it is one sure method to give them the right to vote, but I would not forgo the right of Congress to give it to them without a constitutional amendment.

Mr. BROYHILL. I am merely suggesting that we eliminate the ambiguity. I do not think that would be difficult if the Judiciary Committee would hold hearings on the legislation before it.

Mr. MULTER. But this is before us now.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. MULTER, would you prefer to finish your statement and then answer questions?

Mr. MULTER. No; I think it is much better that the questions be asked and the answers given as the questions arise.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. MULTER, will you yield?

Mr. MULTER. Surely.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I want to express my sincere regard for our colleague, who is a very distinguished member of our committee and who is always loyal to his interests.

I think I heard you say you would be in favor of giving the District a voting Representative in Congress, and if I heard you correctly, is it your idea that the next step probably that would be undertaken would be to make the District a State with two or more U.S. Congressmen and two or more U.S. Senators, and if that is granted I wonder what you think about giving them voting Representatives in the Senate, too?

This is a great concern that I have. We hear so much about taxation without representation. If we grant some kind of home rule would the next step be, "We are still being taxed without representation," and what would be the position of the great city of New York and the State of New York and down the line? That is the question that puzzles me.

Mr. MULTER. It gives me no trouble, BILLY, and may I take a moment to say I appreciate the compliment you pay me. It gives me no trouble because I so frequently refer to the history of the city of New York and State of New York and what happened to my town or city of New York. We did not always have home rule there. We do not have complete home rule yet but we have more than many cities. We had to fight for it all the way and today we have more than many other cities.

It does not bother me that you have a bill—I do not think it is on the list but I think our distinguished colleague from Texas, Mr. TEAGUE, has introduced a bill that is known as a nonsovereign State bill.

Mr. DAVIS. Do you have the number of that bill?

Mr. MULTER. No, I do not, but the newspapers referred to it. I do not know the



number of it but that bill, I think, calls for a voting Member of the House of Representatives and two voting Members of the U.S. Senate.

I do not go for half representation. I say if a citizen is entitled to be represented he is entitled to full representation. If he is entitled to vote he is entitled to vote on everything that concerns him. But I am willing to take this step by step, and I think the first step is to give him some home rule. I do not know of any prohibition against home rule up to 75 years ago. No one tested its constitutionality. It was good at that time. Why could not home rule be good today?

I think the constitutional question is one that should be resolved by the Supreme Court if and when it is tested, but in the meantime I think we should move forward and give the taxpaying citizens of the District of Columbia of the United States of America the right to vote for their local officials and to govern themselves.

And that reminds me of this situation:

If what is said about home rule being unconstitutional is true, and if this language means precisely what it says, that the Congress reserves to itself all the legislative power concerning this District of Columbia, then indeed our Founding Fathers were very foolish and impractical, and I disbelieve that because if that is so everything that is done today by the Commissioners is illegal and unconstitutional. I have not heard anyone say that. Every time you give the Commissioners or the Public Utilities Commission the right to issue a rule or regulation, whether it involves health or sanitation or transportation, that is legislation and a legislative power, and if the Congress did not have the right to give that authority to the Commissioners or to the Public Utilities Commission or any other District Commission, then everything they have done is unconstitutional and everyone who violated an ordinance and paid a fine was fined illegally, and I do not think that is so.

This is my position on these bills and I hope very shortly you will go into executive session and bring forth a bill that can be acted on promptly.

Mr. DAVIS. We appreciate your statement.

I want to ask you some questions about some of the points you touched on.

Mr. MULTER. Surely.

Mr. DAVIS. I notice in House Resolution 320 that you are listed as one of the four Representatives which that resolution provides for recognition by the Speaker to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of H.R. 4630, which is one of the bills you referred to in your statement.

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. You are familiar with House Resolution 320?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, I am.

Mr. DAVIS. That resolution provides that all points of order against the bill are waived and it provides that general debate shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by you or whoever requested the rule for consideration of H.R. 4630, and a Member who is opposed to said bill to be designated by the Speaker.

The resolution further provides that no amendment shall be in order to the bill except those offered by direction of the Member requesting the rule, which could be you or one of the three other Members named in the resolution, and that amendments so offered may be offered to any part of the bill but shall not be subject to amendment.

That strikes me as being a very harsh and stringent gag rule.

This bill, H.R. 4630, is a bill which has 83 pages in it. This resolution also provides

that it shall be considered as read when the debate has been ended.

What is the reason for all these various provisions?

Mr. MULTER. All the reasons I have ever heard urged since I have been a Member of the House in support of closed rules can and should be urged in support of that closed rule. It is no different from any other closed rule that has been reported by the Rules Committee and adopted by the House, and you know, I am sure, the House does not have to adopt this closed rule.

Mr. DAVIS. It expresses your attitude?

Mr. MULTER. That is right, because I think a bill of this kind ought to be considered just as we can consider bills out of the Ways and Means Committee dealing with billions of dollars under a closed rule without amendment when there is much disagreement. Surely we can consider a bill of this kind under the same rule and determine once and for all the issues it raises in this session of Congress and that is, whether or not home rule shall be given to the District and whether or not they shall at least have the right to experiment under home rule for a while.

Mr. DAVIS. How does the gentleman feel that restricting these debates to 1 hour will further the purpose of having home rule this session? Does not the gentleman know that 1 day's debate or 2 days' debate or any reasonable time would not jeopardize the passage of the bill if the House wants to pass it? I would like to know why you want to restrict it to 30 minutes to those in favor and 30 minutes to those opposed when you cannot begin to touch the various provisions in this 83-page bill in that length of time?

Mr. MULTER. May I be presumptuous enough to suggest that the reason for the limitation to 1 hour is that I do not think if you talked about this bill for 10 days a single vote would be changed.

Mr. DAVIS. Is that the gentleman's attitude about legislation generally?

Mr. MULTER. No; it is not.

Mr. DAVIS. Why does the gentleman say it about this bill?

Mr. MULTER. Because on this particular bill I think every Member of the House has made up his mind whether he is for or against home rule and will vote accordingly regardless of how much debate there is.

Mr. DAVIS. Would you say every Member of the House is familiar with the provisions of H.R. 4630?

Mr. MULTER. Just as he is not now, I would say after 20 days' debate every Member would not be familiar with every provision of the bill.

Mr. DAVIS. You do not think debate would inform him as to the provisions?

Mr. MULTER. Debate would inform those willing to stay on the floor during general debate.

Mr. DAVIS. The gentleman knows you have a right to get them on the floor and keep them there.

Mr. MULTER. You cannot if there are 100 on the floor, and that is less than one-fourth of the Members of the House.

Mr. DAVIS. I differ with the gentleman as to the necessity to explain the provisions of a bill.

Mr. MULTER. Before we leave the matter of limitation of debate, I have learned the hard way that all good legislation is the result of compromise, and I am willing to compromise if you and others who feel about it the way you do say 1 hour is not enough. I am willing to agree with you on how much time for debate there should be.

Mr. DAVIS. Let me get the gentleman's idea on how much time he thinks would be reasonable?

Mr. MULTER. I have said I do not think any amount of debating—

Mr. DAVIS. You are a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, are you not?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir; I am.

Mr. DAVIS. That committee reports out many bills and the Rules Committee has always allowed reasonable time for debate on bills out of that committee.

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

Mr. DAVIS. You have referred to tax bills. We all know the reason tax bills come before the House on a closed rule is that experience has demonstrated that it is almost impossible to pass a tax bill unless it comes up under a closed rule.

The gentleman referred to tax bills involving billions of dollars. Appropriation bills also involve billions of dollars and they come up under a closed rule.

Mr. MULTER. Sometimes they do.

Mr. DAVIS. Almost always, but you can offer an amendment any time you want to and get a hearing before the House, and House Members are not prevented from offering amendments and expressing themselves about such amendments as they may offer, and certainly the appropriation bills I do not think can be considered as of lesser importance than the subject matter of this legislation.

What do you say about that?

Mr. MULTER. I say this committee is in charge of that situation. Most of these bills have been before this committee since January. Most of them have been before Congress every session for the last 10 years. I am not accusing anyone of being dilatory, but I am suggesting the answer to any discharge petition is that the committee has had ample time to report out a bill and that the committee can be in control of the kind of rule you wanted brought forth. It is still within the power of this committee to control that.

Mr. DAVIS. Is it your attitude, then, that because the committee has not held hearings on these bills up to this time, to eliminate all the legislative processes and go ahead and adopt these stringent provisions provided for in this resolution which have already been outlined here and assume that this bill, H.R. 4630, is so perfect that no Member of the House other than the four named in House Resolution 320 would be capable of offering an amendment to it that would improve it?

Mr. MULTER. I am sure I can talk for the other three colleagues mentioned in that resolution. None of us claim to know it all, none of us is perfect, and none of us claim we can bring out a perfect bill.

Mr. DAVIS. Why have you restricted it so that the other 433 Members of the House would have no opportunity to offer an amendment or debate it?

Mr. MULTER. Because the discharge petition and the closed rule is as much a part of the legislative processes as the committee system.

Mr. DAVIS. Why have you restricted it further so that if one of these four Members does offer an amendment that no Member of the House will be permitted to amend that amendment?

Mr. MULTER. The same principle applies here regarding the offering of amendments to amendments as to other bills.

Frankly, none of us at this time foresee the necessity for amendments. However, during the course of the debate things may be suggested to improve the bill, and I am sure my colleagues sponsoring this bill will agree to any amendment that will improve the bill.

Mr. DAVIS. But you would not agree that any other Member who disagrees with the propriety of any provision in this bill could offer an amendment?

Mr. MULTER. Most respectfully I say to you we had a choice, a hard choice. We could have an open rule and permit amendments until the end of the session of Congress—whether dilatory or otherwise is unimportant—but under an open rule it could go on

until adjournment. Or if it is a closed rule it must be a closed rule not in part but completely, otherwise those who want this legislation will see it talked to death.

I say that to you most respectfully.

Mr. DAVIS. Again I disagree with the gentleman most respectfully because I am convinced under the rules of the House there cannot be carried on any such dilatory tactics as the gentleman has referred to. I thoroughly disagree with the gentleman regarding the reason he gives for completely eliminating the voice of the House in passing on the provisions of the bill, which is what this gag rule would do.

Mr. MULTER. If the majority of the House disagrees with us the rule will never be adopted. If it agrees with us it will be adopted. That is the democratic way, again with a small "d".

Mr. DAVIS. I think the gentleman obviously wants to be democratic, but if there has ever been an autocratic gag rule presented to the House in the history of this country, this is it.

Mr. MULTER. I urged the same arguments when I was opposed to the gag rule on bills I did not like.

Mr. DAVIS. Did the gentleman change his opinion?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I think it should be pointed out that there is a difference in the procedure followed by the Ways and Means Committee in seeking these closed rules and the very stringent procedure that is being followed here; that is, that this bill has never reached the stage of committee consideration.

The bills which come out of the Ways and Means Committee have received careful studious consideration by that committee and must be recommended by that committee before the Rules Committee will even give consideration to granting a rule. I think there is quite a difference in the procedure. This is a bill that has been arbitrarily selected and as a bill which the proponents seek to push through the House without giving the House an opportunity to work its will on the legislation.

There is quite a bit of difference in the procedure.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. KEARNS.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment my colleague. I think he is very honest and sincere in his conviction. There is also one thing very interesting about him. He always has a very great sense of humor.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. KEARNS. Especially when he said he thought every Member of the House had their minds made up whether or not they would uphold home rule.

I would like the record to show at least some conscientious person living here in Washington did not think so because my telephone rang at 3:30 this morning and at 4:30 this morning asking me to vote for home rule.

I had illness in the family back home so I thought nothing of it and I answered the phone.

There is one conviction I have and I am very sure about it, that when George Washington stepped off this 10-mile square and said, "This shall be the seat of the Federal Government," he never anticipated, neither did we, that the bureaucracies of Government would get to the numbers they are and people would come here as they have, in droves. I share the thinking of my colleague from Virginia about their right to vote for President and Vice President, but in the years that I have had the privilege of serving here on the District Committee, I do not see possibly how the Federal Government can act, be effective in their designated duties being subjected to a municipally controlled government.

I mean it sincerely. Then, too, where are you going to get the money to pay for this? The first year you are going to be in the red. The second year more in the red, the third year more in the red, and coming to Congress every year for money. You do not have the taxable potential here to run as other municipalities do.

There are many things considered. My goodness. You talk about the resolution here. We should have as much debate and read the bill on a subject like this as we would on passing a labor bill here in the Congress. To ever think of getting this through, on that type of thing, my dear friend, I don't think it is fair to the people. I don't think it is fair to the Congress, and above all I don't think it is fair to our concept of our form of Government.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, may I thank Mr. KEARNS for the remarks he made about me and indicate to him that I feel as strongly as he does at the annoyance that was tendered to him. I think it was deliberate annoyance and if they did that to me as strongly as I feel about this bill, I might change my vote. That might change my vote faster than anything else. I think that kind of annoyance and nuisance just cannot be condoned. It is wrong.

With reference to the financial situation the gentleman referred to, may I there again call upon my personal knowledge of operations in the city of New York. We have the second biggest budget in the country. There is no budget bigger than that of the city of New York except that of the U.S. Government.

But we do not hesitate to come to the Congress, and our mayor comes down here regularly asking the Congress to help us out financially. And every other city does. Every State does, too. The District of Columbia will be no different than it is now.

Mr. McMILLAN. Has the city of New York had any assistance to help operate the city government from the Congress of the United States?

Mr. MULTER. If we take "government" in its all-inclusive term, which I am sure we must, and that is the entire operation of the city of New York, we get money for the city of New York for housing, without which we would have no public housing. That comes from the Congress.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am talking about operating the city government. I want to get some, too, if you can get some in New York.

Mr. MULTER. Our mayor and our city council, elected by the people of the city of New York, our board of estimate, elected by the people of the city of New York, have their salaries and expenses paid out of the budget which is raised by taxation upon the citizens of the city of New York, those residing and working there.

That does not give us all the money we need with which to operate.

Mr. McMILLAN. Since the gentleman is one of the leaders in this proposed legislation, I wonder if he could tell the committee who he would provide or give permission to vote here in the District of Columbia.

It seems that we have so many categories of people here as brought out in the last hearings who would not be permitted to vote in the District, I wondered who you would permit to vote.

Mr. MULTER. I would permit to vote in the District any person who has a bona fide legal residence in the District and has had it and maintained it at least 1 year prior to the election in which he participates.

Mr. McMILLAN. That would exclude Government employees?

Mr. MULTER. Those Government employees are voting back home now. A Government employee comes down here from back home and lives in a house and he registers from the

last place he voted. He takes a Government job and he can vote forever and a day from that residence even though the house is torn down.

It is still his bona fide residence according to the law.

Mr. McMILLAN. There are 2,500 people working here on Capitol Hill. Would they be permitted to vote?

Mr. MULTER. If they give up their legal residence back in their home State and establish a bona fide residence here and maintain it at least 1 year prior to election, they should have a right to vote.

Every citizen of the United States should have the right to vote once in a general election but not in two different places, in one place only.

Mr. McMILLAN. How about Navy personnel? Would they be permitted to vote here?

Mr. MULTER. They vote from their bona fide legal residence at home.

Mr. McMILLAN. Who would vote in the District?

Mr. MULTER. They would not vote in the District unless they changed their legal residence.

Every man has that right. If I did it and moved out of the State I would lose my seat in Congress. That is not a right, but a privilege. If I want to give up that privilege by moving out of my home State, that is my business.

I can move anywhere within the State and still retain my right to vote within that State.

Mr. McMILLAN. We all know that. The record should show who shall be eligible to vote in the District of Columbia should this bill become a law.

Mr. DAVIS. Can the gentleman tell us what percentage of the residents of the District of Columbia would be excluded from voting under his bill by reason of the fact that they maintain a legal voting residence in some other State?

Mr. MULTER. I have no such statistic, sir. I am sorry I cannot give it to you. I don't know if anybody has that statistic.

Mr. DAVIS. That would be quite a substantial number, would it not?

Mr. MULTER. I would not even try to guess, sir. I don't know. I have never seen any figure that attempted to give it to us. I do know that most Government employees have been moving out of the District and living in Maryland, nearby Maryland, nearby Virginia. But how many still live in the District, I have no idea.

Mr. DAVIS. The gentleman, I believe, stated in his initial statement that every person was entitled to have the right to vote for representatives.

Did I understand you correctly?

Mr. MULTER. I did say that although that is not in any of the bills that are before you.

Mr. DAVIS. Why, then, especially in view of your feeling, is that not included in H.R. 4630 and these other bills?

Mr. MULTER. We are trying to get as much support for a bill as possible. We tried to bring forth the least controversial bill and that is why the resolution, H. J. Res. 320, refers to H.R. 4630, which is the so-called administration bill. Frankly, I think if we took the other bill which was passed by the Senate the Republicans in the House would probably not support us. They will support the President's bill, the administration's recommendation and that is the bill which I put in under H.R. 4630. This is one instance where I think we need all the bipartisan support we can get. I am willing to compromise and give up the Morse bill for the administration bill for the Republican support.

Mr. DAVIS. I have read some of the provisions of H.R. 4630, not all of them as yet, although I intend to, but I notice that this bill provides for a Governor and a Secretary.



I notice also that although the gentleman has expressed himself very sincerely and earnestly as being in favor of giving the people of the District the right to vote and self government that this bill does not give them the right to vote for the Governor and the Secretary the highest two offices in the bill.

It provides that those officers shall be appointed by the President and also provides that they can be removed by the President at his pleasure.

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

Mr. DAVIS. Why does the gentleman wish to prevent the people of the District from voting for those two high officers and yet have the right to vote for certain others?

Mr. MULTER. I think you put it unintentionally in reverse, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to prevent them from doing that.

Mr. DAVIS. Your bill does that.

Mr. MULTER. The bill does not give them that privilege. I hope some day we will get a law that will give it to them but this is, I think, as far as we can go at this time.

Mr. DAVIS. Isn't that one of the most important things you could give them?

Mr. MULTER. It is a very important thing, but it is not the most important thing. In order to get a bill past a Presidential veto I am willing to go along with the President in this instance and let him have the appointive power and hope in 1961 we can change it and have a President who will go along with elective power and give up his own appointive power.

As of today I do not think we can get the President to go along with a bill that will permit us to elect the Governor or the mayor, as the case may be. He will go along with a bill which will call for an appointment by himself or by his successor.

Mr. DAVIS. I have noticed that many people threatened the Congress in recent days and weeks with a possible veto by the President.

I am glad to have your voice added to the list.

Mr. MULTER. Many a time, and the housing bill is one time, when I said, "Let's override the President's veto and let's send him a bill whether he likes it or not, which we think is a good bill," but there there is a difference of opinion as to the contents of the bill, as to whether it is inflationary or less inflationary than that which he wants.

Mr. DAVIS. Are there any further questions?

Mr. BROYHILL. One more question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. BROYHILL. I would like to compliment the gentleman for a very fine statement, particularly for his excellent sense of humor.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. BROYHILL. As the gentleman knows, when the Federal city was laid out, 100 square miles, a 10-mile square, in 1847 the portion west of the Potomac was ceded back to the State of Virginia, 66 square miles. Has the gentleman ever given consideration to the desirability of ceding a large portion of that part that was contributed by Maryland back to the State of Maryland and let the residential areas and a large portion of the business areas be part of the State of Maryland and then reduce the size of this Federal city?

It was done once before. I wondered if we might cut down some more of it.

Mr. MULTER. Under our system of government you cannot force a gift upon people, and I do not think Maryland would accept the gift. I do not think Maryland would accept the cession.

Mr. MATTHEWS. If you will yield.

Mr. BROYHILL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I believe all of our colleagues from Maryland have introduced home rule legislation. I believe I am correct.

I know they are sincerely anxious to give our people voting rights such as people in the State have. I am not so sure of that. I wonder, with their enthusiasm and their active cooperation, if maybe the State of Maryland would not be glad to have the opportunity of gaining so many fine citizens from here in the District of Columbia. I am really serious about that. We were talking a while ago about everybody having different ideas about home rule. I want to say to my colleague I have talked to many Members of the House who say they are in favor of some home rule and actually at least four or five Congressmen have suggested that that fundamental idea is right. I know it is difficult. I know it can't be worked out easily, but they said, "It would get rid of all my objections if we could tie in the District with Maryland." I do not think that is a facetious suggestion. I want to emphasize it. Many a Congressman has spoken to me about it.

Mr. BROYHILL. I want the record to show that over a hundred years ago Virginia did its share and its part.

Mr. DAVIS. I would like to ask the gentleman, what is the reasoning behind the provisions in this bill, H.R. 4630, which do not or would not give any representation whatever in the Senate to residents of the District?

Mr. MULTER. Again, we have tried to follow tradition and what we think will gather the greatest number of votes, the most support.

Mr. DAVIS. What objection do you see in the residents of the District having representation in the Senate?

Mr. MULTER. I see none, but I do not think we can get that kind of a bill through today. I think what we have to do is first give them territorial status, representation as Alaska and Hawaii had before they had statehood, a nonvoting delegate, the same as Puerto Rico has, a nonvoting commissioner, giving them a nonvoting Representative in the House first and eventually give that Representative the right to vote.

Mr. DAVIS. Eventually give them statehood.

Mr. MULTER. Whether statehood or not, or simply a right to participate in the right of the Government of the Nation I think is unimportant. I respect all of those who so sincerely urge the States rights theories. I am not a States righter. I think this Government and this Nation of ours can grow and prosper and continue to be the greatest country on God's earth without individual States reserving to themselves all the powers they demand. I think today, with communications what they are, with transportation as fast as it is, when you can get in a matter of hours from one part of the world to the other—not the country, the world—that you do not need this decentralization of Government to the States that we did need many years ago so that whether the District of Columbia has a representative form of self-government is not the test. Every citizen has a right to vote for President and to vote for a Representative in the House of Representatives, and two Senators in the U.S. Senate. I think those are things that they are entitled to. I do not think the Congress is ready to give them to them at this time. Eventually I hope Congress will see fit to do that. I think this bill is as far as we can get a majority of the House to go at this time. The Senate has already indicated they will do this. This is as far, I think, as we can go today, to get a bill to the President which he will sign.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I do not want to belabor that point, Mr. Chairman, but the gentlemen in the other body are so anxious to have us adopt it I wonder why they are opposed to a delegate.

Mr. MULTER. I have said to those who discussed it with me over there, "We will get two Representatives in your body there some day from the District of Columbia."

Mr. DAVIS. Of course, all this legislation ought to be aimed toward fairness and justice and toward securing the appropriate voice in the Government. I presume that is what is behind it.

The gentleman has just stated he does not see too much need for continuance of States rights. I believe that was the substance of what was just said. If I have misquoted you, I wish you would correct me, but if State lines and State functions are to be eliminated, it would seem to me that that is all the more reason why the citizen should have a stronger voice in the Federal Government, in the concentrated Government here in Washington.

If they are not to have States rights, not to have the rights of a citizen of a State, then if their status is to be changed, they ought to be given as strong a voice as possible in the operation of the Federal Government and if you deny them representation in the Senate, you are just giving them what might be called second-class citizenship. Is that not right?

Mr. MULTER. There is substance of what the gentleman says but I say if we cannot give them all the gentleman suggests we have, let's give them part of it now. I will join the gentleman in giving them the rest of it. I will join the gentleman and anybody else in this House or in the Senate to give them all the complete representation and rights that they should have, including the right to elect a voting Representative to the House, and two voting Senators in the U.S. Senate and to vote for the President and the Vice President. I will go along with anybody who will go all the way and I will also go part of the way part of the time until we can get part of it and gradually move along.

Mr. DAVIS. Inasmuch as the gentleman is the present witness before the subcommittee I just want to get all these matters stated as clearly as possible.

Are there further questions?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I think it might be well for Mr. MULTER to describe to the committee the means by which the Federal contribution to the District government will be determined, if any, and why there should be a Federal contribution if we are to grant autonomy to the city itself, any contribution other than a payment in lieu of taxes on the same formula as payments are made in the States.

Mr. MULTER. I think a complete answer would be that if you can set up a local home rule government here and you enact legislation which will require the Federal Government to pay to the local government a sum each year in lieu of taxes upon the full appraised or assessed value of all of the operations of the U.S. Government in the District, they will have more money than they will need and they will be able to make a contribution back to the U.S. Government. That, of course, is a fair way of handling the situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You are referring to a payment on property owned by the Federal Government?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What are you going to do about parks and playgrounds owned by the Federal Government, deed them to the city?

Mr. MULTER. Do you think we in the Congress ought to exercise jurisdiction over them, operate and maintain them?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Quite obviously I do not, but we are doing it at the present time. Do you feel those should be deeded to the city so that they would relieve the Federal Government from paying in lieu of taxes?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, but relieve the Federal Government of its obligation to support them, no, because most of the people who use those recreational facilities in and around the District of Columbia are the

tourists, American citizens who come to their Capital from all over the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Those tourists bring money into the Capital, don't they?

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is not a city in the United States who would not be tickled pink to have these facilities provided for their city by the Federal Government and let them enjoy the benefits of it, is there?

Mr. MULTER. I am not so sure about that. It is an economic situation you cannot argue intelligently about unless you have the exact figures and know precisely what we are talking about. I think we can generalize about it, but it will get us nowhere. The fact is even if we give home rule to the District, the U.S. Government must, in my opinion, continue to make a fair contribution to the maintenance of those facilities in and around the District of Columbia that are used by all of the American citizens.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Isn't that going quite a bit further than the Federal Government does with respect to other cities?

Mr. MULTER. What do we do with our national parks outside the District.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not referring to national parks.

Mr. MULTER. Don't you think the recreational facilities of parks in the District of Columbia are national parks?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let's stick to this situation for a minute. You mentioned facilities. Isn't it your purpose to put the city of Washington on exactly the same footing insofar as possible as Kansas City, New York City, Chicago, or other cities and municipalities?

Mr. MULTER. I cannot say that I can't say that any bill goes that far. I do not think you can ever go all the way in the District of Columbia as long as this is the capital of the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the very point. That is the very reason.

Mr. MULTER. I do not think we ought to confuse the issue.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is the reason the fathers gave for setting this aside as a separate district.

It gave Congress exclusive control over it.

Mr. MULTER. They didn't see at that time a country stretching from the Atlantic to

the Pacific and from the Rio Grande to Canada and they did not foresee all of the difficulties and problems we have today. I am sure one thing they did foresee is that no American citizen should ever be deprived of his right to participate in his own government. I think that is what we should concentrate on here in this bill. We will worry about the financial situations and the financial problems a little later.

Let's give these people their basic, fundamental right to govern themselves.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You think this bill does it even though it does not give them a voice in the Senate nor does it give them a vote in the House?

Mr. MULTER. It gives them only a part of what they are entitled to.

Mr. DAVIS. Are there further questions?

Mr. MULTER. You still insist that all of the provisions of House Resolution 320 remain in that resolution?

Mr. MULTER. I am willing to discuss with those who are of a mind to compromise, a compromise resolution in exchange for support for the bill or the resolution.

Mr. DAVIS. What is your position on those things that I asked you about?

Mr. MULTER. As of now, sir, I favor that resolution but my mind is never closed to improvements or amendments that may get additional support for it.

Mr. DAVIS. What would be the method of changing the provisions of this resolution? Has the gentleman studied that any?

Mr. MULTER. First, I think we would have to determine what support we can gain for what amendment. I mean this would have to be a matter of sitting down around the conference table and a matter of give and take.

I think it can be worked out. If there is a will to bring a bill to the House and get it enacted, I think we can work out a method of doing that.

Mr. DAVIS. You won't know whether there is a will to do that or not, will you, until the House votes on this resolution?

Mr. MULTER. We can try to improve it in advance. I think we have a pretty good idea of who is opposed to the resolution, who is opposed to the bill, and if any of those Members are willing to give up some of their

opposition in exchange for an amendment, either to the rule or to the bill, I think all of the sponsors of this legislation, including those representing the people in the District of Columbia, I am sure, will be happy to appoint a committee and sit down and discuss with the opponents of the measure how it can be improved so as to eliminate their opposition.

Mr. DAVIS. Does the gentleman have any move in mind of bringing about such a conference?

Mr. MULTER. Frankly, I did not.

Mr. DAVIS. Or such a discussion?

Mr. MULTER. No. I have nothing in mind, because until this morning I had no idea there was any will to compromise or any desire to compromise on the part of the opponents of the measure. If there is such a desire and such a will, we would be very happy to sit down and discuss it.

Mr. DAVIS. But as of now the gentleman does not have any such move in mind?

Mr. MULTER. No.

May I make one more very frank statement about this entire matter, and please believe that I do not intend to offend anybody.

Starting again in my home district, where many people say I come from a one-party district, where in the last election I got some 78 percent of the vote, I might just as well resign or never run again if I voted against a home-rule measure such as these that are before this committee.

I appreciate that many Members in this House and on this committee are in the opposite position, where, if they voted for a home-rule measure, they might just as well resign or not run again. Those are the political facts of life. There isn't much we can do about it, except I think we all, as good American citizens, ought to combine and concentrate our efforts toward bringing something before the House and let the House work its will; and when the majority has spoken, we bow in humility and say, "This is it; maybe we will be the majority next time."

Mr. DAVIS. Well, thank you very much, Mr. MULTER.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, gentlemen, for listening to me.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, AUGUST 27, 1959

(Legislative day of Wednesday, August 26, 1959)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

This day, O Master, let us walk with Thee. Teach us Thy patience. Help us to learn more and more to live by the faith that life's true values are spiritual and are expressed in our daily contacts by character and kindness, cheerfulness, humility, and compassion, and that the chief issues we face lie deeper far than human praise or blame, and have to do with life's meaning and purpose and ultimate goals.

In spite of the tangle and darkness of the world we would serve and all our own secret sorrows and disappointments and defeats, steel our hearts to keep the faith that Thy will for all mankind is coming at last to its coronation, for Thine is the

kingdom and the power and the glory. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, August 26, 1959, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

## REPORT ON U.S. PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(For text of President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Foreign Relations Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Passport Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, for the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business, subject to a 3-minute limitation on statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the